DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 445 UD 009 835

AUTHOR Fox, Louise W.

TITLE Program To Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1968-69.

INSTITUTION Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.

REPORT NO CUE-P-0369; E008e

PUB DATE Nov 69

NOTE 105p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.35

DESCRIPTORS Attendance, *Compensatory Education, Federal Programs, *Program Administration, *Program Evaluation, Reading Improvement, Remedial Instruction, *Urban Schools

IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, New York City

ABSTRACT

It is claimed that the funded program, the subject of this study, never existed per se, except on paper. It was found that over half of the schools did not receive new project personnel designated under program guidelines. Moreover, substantial numbers of principals and teachers did not even know their schools were participating in the program. Yet evaluation gleaned from school personnel was found highly favorable even though no concrete effects could be identified in attendance and achievement data. The positive personnel evaluation is accounted for by the suggestion that project funds were actually used to support an already established curriculum of remedial instruction. Discussions and charts of the findings of classroom observations, attendance, and reading achievement, and evaluations of principals, project personnel, and teachers are, nevertheless, described. (KG)

ED038445

E005e

Project No. 0369

PROGRAM TO IMPROVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS

by Louise W. Fox

October 1969

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1968-69

UD009835E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

ED038445

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

PROGRAM TO IMPROVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS

Louise W. Fox
with
Maureen Smith assisted by Alice Pinsley

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

UD009835E

November 1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone and Dr. Samuel McClelland of the Bureau of Research, to Dr. Daniel Schrieber, Superintendent of the Junior High School Division, and to Mr. Daniel Marshall of the Vocational High School Division at the Board of Education, for their assistance. We wish also to thank Mrs. Miriam Honig, who helped us obtain achievement data for thousands of children.

To the many principals (and their secretarial staffs) and teachers, who made themselves available to us and who shared with us their opinions, a special note of gratitude.

To my personal staff, Mrs. Maureen Smith, who worked unstintingly on every aspect of this evaluation, Miss Alice Pinsley, who helped write this final report, and to Mrs. Henrietta Wolkoff, Mrs. Janet Liebman and Miss Betty Goldstein who prepared the manuscript, a special note of recognition. To Sophie Colten, Eloise DeSilva, Mary Dover, Rae Feeley, David Guthwin, Manny Kay, Robert Kelley, Howard Schapker, Joseph Schenker, Cathy Shiflett, and Josephine Thomas as well, a heartfelt "Thank you."

I could not conclude these acknowledgements without a special note of appreciation to my husband, Dr. David J. Fox, whose vast experience and wisdom provided us with many suggestions for the implementation of this evaluation, and whose warmth, support and smile made all the rough spots smooth.

Louise W. Fox

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

INTRODUCTION 1

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT 2

II. THE EVALUATION PLAN 4

- Design of the Evaluation 4
- Instruments 5

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION 8

- Schools and Children Included in Sample 8
- The Observers 12

IV. FINDINGS: INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT (ILOR) . 14

- Aspects of Lesson and Student Group 14
- Physical Environment 15
- Aspects of Elementary Level Observations 15
- Junior High School Level Observations 18
- Vocational High Schools 23
- Summary of ILOR Data 27

V. FINDINGS: ATTENDANCE AND READING ACHIEVEMENT 28

- Attendance Data 28
- Reading Achievement 28

VI. FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS, PROJECT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS 33

- Implementation of the Program 33
- Dynamics of the Program 49
- Evaluation of the Project 57

VII. CONCLUSION 65

A POSTSCRIPT 67

Appendix A: Distribution of Ethnic Background of Pupils Attending Schools Participating in the Project, by Borough . . . .

Appendix B: Instruments . . . .

Appendix C: Staff List . . . .

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
III-1.	Distribution of Schools Included in the Sample by Borough, Level, and Method of Data Collection . .	9
III-2.	Distribution of Children in the Sample by Grade Level and Sex	10
III-3.	Comparison Data Collected in Brooklyn for a Selected Elementary, Junior High and Vocational High School Sample	11
IV-1.	Observer Rating of ILOR Aspects of Teacher Functioning, Elementary School Reading Lessons . . .	17
IV-2.	Ratings of Observers on Aspects of Children's Functioning at the Elementary School Level During Lessons in Reading	19
IV-3.	Observer Ratings of ILOR Aspects of Teacher Functioning, Junior High School Reading Lessons . .	21
IV-4.	Ratings of Observers on Aspects of Children's Functioning at the Junior High School Level During Lessons in Reading	22
IV-5.	Observers' Ratings of ILOR Aspects of Teacher Functioning, Vocational High School Reading and Other Lessons	25
IV-6.	Ratings of Observers on Aspects of Children's Functioning at the Vocational High School Level During Reading and Other Lessons	26
V-1.	Current Status in Reading, in Quartiles, by Current Grade, Program and Comparison Children, for 1969 . .	29
V-2.	Percentage of Children with Indicated Change in Reading Level 1968-69; by Current Grade, Program and Control Children	31
VI-1.	Dates on Which the Principals and Project Teachers Were Informed About the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools" at the Elementary, Junior High School and Vocational High School Levels	38

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table | Page

VI-2. Dates When Full Participation in the Project Was Initiated in the Elementary, Junior High School and Vocational High School According to Project Teachers 39

VI-3. Methods of Pupil Selection According to Principals of Elementary, Junior High Schools and Vocational High School Levels 44

VI-4. Methods of Pupil Selection According to Project Personnel at the Elementary, Junior High School and Vocational High School Levels 45

VI-5. Methods of Pupil Selection According to Classroom Teachers at Elementary, Junior High School and Vocational High School Levels 46

VI-6. Materials Provided for the Project According to Principals and Project Teachers by School Level . . 48

INTRODUCTION

As a means of orienting the reader to this report, we wish to make clear at the beginning that there is reasonable doubt in our minds that the project titled, "Program to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools," as originally designed and funded, ever actually existed other than on paper. Our experience, as the data will indicate, from the inception of this evaluation, strongly suggests that the "Project" was a function of payroll rather than of program. To cite two pieces of evidence; most schools were never aware that the project existed until we informed them that they were participating; and as late as May 1969, four weeks before the termination of the project, many school personnel were under the impression that the designated participating children were attending special classes outside of the regular school building. The corrective reading personnel were continuing the same work they have been doing anywhere from one to ten years, with most averaging about four years in their present appointments.

We have done an extensive evaluation of the activities being conducted by the staff paid by this project, and that is the report that follows.

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The increasing intensity and sharpness of the problems of poverty area schools, partially manifested by the 45,714 elementary school pupils who performed two years or more below grade level on the 1967 Metropolitan Achievement Test, provided the rationale for the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools, Title I Project #912623." This is the final report of the evaluation of that project which was cycled for the September 1968-June 1969 school year and which encompassed 361 New York City public elementary, junior high and vocational high schools. This evaluation is a quantitative and qualitative description of the implementation of that project and the impact it has had on the children and school staff participating in it.

The stated goals[1] of the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools" were:

1. To provide the target population (primarily grade three of elementary schools, and some fourth, fifth and sixth grades, intermediate schools, junior high schools, and vocational high schools) with compensatory services to combat effects of educational and economic deprivation.

2. To improve academic skills.

3. To improve attitude toward school.

4. To improve emotional and social stability.

These goals were to be reached primarily through the provision of 533 additional teachers and increased services in corrective reading, remediation in math, small group and individual instruction and remediation in other academic areas.

At the elementary level, 188 additional Title I positions were allocated to 191 New York City schools. The main objective was an intensive reading remediation program geared primarily to third grade children, but also including fourth, fifth and sixth graders. Of the 188 allocated positions, 30 were to increase and intensify services to selected third grade children, and 158 were to supplement the existing tax levy corrective reading positions for grades three through six.

---

[1] Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools, Proposal 912623, p. 1.

At the junior high school and intermediate level, 202 additional Title I positions were to be allocated to 150 schools: 67 for corrective reading teachers, and 135 for remediation in math and allied academic areas.

The 20 vocational high schools were to receive an additional 143 Title I positions aimed at small group and individualized instruction, tutoring of individual students, remedial work, guidance, and other special services to enhance chances for success.

The activities of the project were originally designed to be carried out for the full academic year from September 1968 to June 1969, covering 188 days.

At the elementary school level it was proposed that teaching be done in small groups of eight to ten children and that no teacher should be responsible for more than 100 children, as each child was to receive remedial instruction twice a week. At the other levels the project design called for "small group instruction" but left unstipulated the size of the group.

Additionally, the project called for special activities for older junior high school students who were potential drop-outs. These services included special curriculum, part-time work experiences, and intensive counseling.

At the secondary level, supportive personnel, including psychiatrists, social workers, and guidance counselors, were to provide intensive services to children and their families.

Where children at any level were to be assisted in reading, workshops for their parents were to be conducted by each school district. The individual district Corrective Reading Coordinators were to be responsible for the training of the corrective reading personnel assigned to the project.

CHAPTER II

THE EVALUATION PLAN

A. DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION

The major purposes of this evaluation were to obtain quantitative and qualitative measurements of the impact of this project on the children and staff participating in it.

The first measurement involved an estimate of the quantitative implementation of the project, in terms of the number of positions allocated; the number of children served; and the extent to which special materials and curricula were developed. Additionally, investigation was made of the size of instructional groups; the teacher-pupil ratio; the ways in which "additional positions" were used at the senior high school level; and the extent to which "parent involvement," specifically in workshops, was implemented.

At the qualitative level a description was sought of the teachers in terms of their background, experience, and special training. Particular attention was given to those designated as Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics Teachers.

In order to further assess the implementation of the project, qualitative measurements were gathered on the materials used and the quality of instruction provided.

The impact of the project was evaluated by measuring the effects of the program on reading scores and other aspects of academic achievement. Attendance data for children participating in the program were compared with children not in the program. Finally, in all the schools visited, the researchers solicited the reactions and impressions of the program on the part of regular classroom teachers, teaching personnel assigned under the program, and principals.

The data were collected by two processes. One was the compilation of clerical information. This included the number of children participating, teachers involved, and scores on achievement tests (such as the Metropolitan Achievement Battery) both before and after the 1968-1969 school year.

In the second process, a staff of qualified and trained observers, drawn from the faculties of metropolitan colleges and universities, visited schools, observed lessons, rated instruction, and interviewed teachers, principals and specially assigned personnel, using structured interview guides and rating scales which had been specifically designed for this purpose.

B. INSTRUMENTS

A detailed description of the instruments developed by the researchers and used in this evaluation follows:

1. Interview Guides

In order to provide principals, project teachers, and classroom teachers of children participating in this project with an opportunity to express their opinions about the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools," the observers conducted individual face-to-face interviews on each school visit. These were structured interviews, in which the observer was given a specific list of questions to ask. (See Appendix B.)

There were three interview guides and each asked for an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the project and for recommendations about the project as perceived by the respondent. The guides also noted: method of selection of children for the project, parental response to the project, the dates on which the project was initiated, and the background of the respondent. Each of the three guides was intended to provide unique information appropriate to the role of the respondent.

a. Interview Guide for Project Personnel

This interview guide was designed to cover the following areas: 1. the project teacher's perceptions and expectations of pupil progress; 2. the number and size of the groups taught by the project teacher; 3. the extent to which special materials and curriculum were developed; 4. the project teacher's relationship with the classroom teacher; and 5. the extent of special training received by the project teacher.

b. Classroom Teacher Interview Guide

This interview guide was designed for the classroom teachers of those children attending project classes. It was intended to describe: 1. the number of children from the teacher's class who attend the project classes and how often; 2. the teacher's perception of the children's attitude toward the project; 3. the teacher's relationship with the project teacher and the consistency of work done in both classes; and 4. changes seen by the classroom teacher in the pupils as a result of this project.

c. Principal Interview Guide

This interview guide covered the following areas: 1. the present school population; 2. whether or not the principal had seen a copy of the project proposal or had been officially informed about the project; 3. the extent of principal participation in the planning of this project; 4. personnel changes as a result of this project; 5. the training of project teachers; 6. the principal's evaluation of the impact of the project on the pupils and teachers involved; and 7. any physical changes made to accommodate this project.

2. ILOR (Individual Lesson Observation Record

This instrument was the basic device for obtaining observers' perceptions of the lessons observed. The ILOR consists of two sections: one provides for the details of the lesson observed and the other contains rating scales covering specific aspects of the lesson.

In the first section the observer was asked to indicate: content of lesson observed, i.e., subject area; the length of the lesson; approximate number of children in the teaching unit; nature of the grouping for instruction, i.e., grade level, age level, achievement level, etc.; and whether or not the lesson seemed typical of normal functioning in that teaching unit.

The second section of the ILOR was developed to assess aspects of teacher functioning. Aspects such as the use of teaching aids, amount of material covered, depth of instruction, planning and organization, and quality of instruction were rated on a five-point scale centered around a midpoint considered "average." Above this midpoint were two ratings, "better than average" and "oustanding." Below the midpoint were two parallel negative ratings, "below average" and "extremely poor."

Other aspects of teacher functioning, such as reference to earlier material, developing the foundation for independent work, individualization of instruction, relevance to child's age level, and creativity and imagination, were rated on a three-point scale centering around a mid point, "provided some opportunity." Above the midpoint was a positive rating of "provided considerable opportunity." Below the midpoint was the parallel negative rating of "provided little or no opportunity."

The last area consisted of items on the children's functioning. Aspects such as interest and enthusiasm, participation, understanding, spontaneous questions, and volunteering in response to teacher's questions were rated on a five-point scale. The midpoint centered on "about half." Above it were two ratings, "more than half" and "every or almost every child"; below it were the two ratings "less than half" and "very few or none."

The reliability of the instrument based on the percent of times independent observers agree in their evaluation of the same lesson has been estimated at 90 to 96 percent.[1]

3. Achievement Tests in Reading and Arithmetic

The estimates of children's academic achievement reported in this study are all obtained from the administration of Metropolitan Achievement Tests. The tests in reading were administered in October 1967, April 1968, and March 1969. Tests in arithmetic were given in March 1967, March 1968, and April 1969, as part of the city-wide testing program. The tests were given in class by the regular classroom teacher. They were scored by the district scoring service provided by the publisher. Our clerical staff visited 87 schools and obtained the 1967 and 1968 Metropolitan Achievement reading scores from the pupil's cumulative record card. Through provision made by the Center for Urban Education and through the cooperation of the Board of Education,[2] scores for the March 1969 reading scores were made available to the project staff.

4. Attendance Records

Attendance records for 1966-67, 1967-68, and Fall 1968 for each pupil were obtained by our clerical staff from the Cumulative Record Card. The Spring 1969 attendance records for each pupil were supplied by classroom teachers through a return mail questionnaire.

5. Ethnic Distribution Statistics

Ethnic distributions of all the children in all of the schools participating in this project were compiled and appear in Appendix A.

---

[1] David J. Fox, Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program, Center for Urban Education, October 1967.

[2] We are grateful to Miriam Honig of the central staff of the Board of Education for arranging this.

CHAPTER III

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION

A. SCHOOLS AND CHILDREN INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

The 87 schools comprising the sample were randomly selected from a listing of all project schools, according to borough. The districts were sampled proportionally by number of project schools existing within the district. A group of comparison children was selected from schools in which the project did not exist. Each comparison school was in the same district as project schools.

The schools in the sample were included in one of two data-gathering activities; only clerical records were examined for data on children's achievement and attendance; and schools were visited by observers, in addition to clerical data being obtained.

In the case where only clerical records were obtained, these data were collected by the researcher's trained staff from each child's record card. All told, clerical data for 3,357 children in 87 schools were obtained.

Table III-1 presents a break-down of all of the schools in the sample by borough, level, and method of data collection.

Of the 191 elementary schools participating in this project, the 49 from which data were collected represent a 26 percent sample. Of the 150 junior high schools participating, data were obtained from 29, constituting a 20 percent sample. Of the 20 vocational high schools participating, the sample includes nine, or 45 percent. Thus, of the total 361 New York City participating schools, data were collected from a sample of 87, or approximately 24 percent. The consistency with which the researchers encountered confusion about the "Project," and the high number of schools which reported that they were not participating, caused a reduction in the original plan for a general overall sample of 33 percent to 24 percent. The probability of not finding any new pattern was so great that further expenditure of public funds was deemed unwarranted and indeed wasteful.

Table III-2 presents the distribution of children according to grade level and sex. Comparison data are presented separately in Table III-3.

The comparison data for children not participating in the project were restricted to one borough, Brooklyn. Schools were selected which were in the same districts as participating schools, but which were not "Project" schools. In some instances we sampled children in schools which had the "Project" but who were not involved in it. Table III-3 presents the distribution by grade and sex for this group of children.

TABLE III-1

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE BY BOROUGH, LEVEL, AND METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Level and Kind of Data	Manhattan	Bronx	Brooklyn	Queens	Richmond	Total
Elementary						
Clerical and observational data	12	10	12	7	1	42
Clerical only	1	2	3	-	-	6
Comparison data	-	-	1[a]	-	-	1
Total	13	12	16	7	1	49
Junior High Schools (including Intermediate Schools)						
Clerical and observational data	5	7	9	6	1	28
Clerical only	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comparison data	-	-	1[b]	-	-	1
Total	5	7	10[b]	6	1	29[b]
Vocational High Schools						
Clerical and observational data	2	2	2	1	0	7
Clerical only	2	-	-	-	-	2
Comparison data	-	-	*[c]	-	-	*
Total	4	2	2	1	-	9
Total number of schools by borough	22	21	28	14	2	87

[a] Of these four comparison elementary schools, three were schools in which data were collected from both project and non-project classes.

[b] One of the two comparison junior high schools contained project classes.

[c] The comparison vocational high school was also a project school.

TABLE III-2

DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN THE SAMPLE BY GRADE LEVEL AND SEX

		Number of Children		
Grade Level	Number of Classes	Boys	Girls	Total
2	50	146	134	280
3	93	258	192	450
4	93	272	173	445
5	75	189	171	360
6	17	106	92	198
7	35	71	51	122
8	20	71	63	134
9	50	340	164	504
10	13	109	28	137
11	29	112	72	184
12	15	83	68	151
Total	490	1,757	1,208	2,965

TABLE III-3

COMPARISON DATA COLLECTED IN BROOKLYN FOR A SELECTED ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL SAMPLE

Level	Number of Schools	Grade Level	Number of Classes	Number of Children Boys	 Girls	 Total
Elementary	4	3	6	108	72	180
		4	2	37	34	71
Total				145	106	251
Junior high school	2	7	7	51	41	92
Vocational high school	1	9	4	11	-	11
		10	6	21	-	21
		11	6	17	-	17
Total				49	-	49
Total comparison data collected				245	147	392

Thus, data were collected for 2,965 children participating in the project, and for 392 children not participating in the project, or a total of 3,357 children. The sex distribution for comparison groups at elementary and junior high levels roughly replicates that of the sample. However, there were no females in the vocational high comparison.

B. THE OBSERVERS

This evaluation involved 18 observers, all of whom are professional educators. They included both elementary and secondary school curriculum specialists, as well as two remedial reading specialists. All are currently participating in teacher education programs and have direct contact with urban public school systems.

Each observer received an orientation prior to his visit to the schools. The purpose of the study was explained, and the instruments were distributed and reviewed. Each observer was instructed in the use of each instrument. Throughout the study continuous communication was maintained with the observers. At the completion of this evaluation each observer was asked to write a resumé of his own perceptions and evaluation of the project.

1. Observational Data

During the months of March, April, and May, the observers made 104 observations of remedial classes conducted under the aegis of the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools." At the elementary level, there were 43 reading and five "other" lessons evaluated at the junior high school level, 32 reading and 11 "other," and at the vocational high school level eight reading and seven "other." The "other" category included Science, Math, Guidance, English, and Social Studies. Since there were so few of each of these, they were combined for purposes of analysis. Each observer completed the ILOR as described above for each lesson which was observed. These 104 completed ILORs serve as the basis of the evaluation of the quality of instruction within the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools."

2. Interview Data

Using the interview guides developed for this project (see Appendix B) observers interviewed a total of 76 principals (41 elementary, 28 junior high and seven vocational high).

They also interviewed 123 regular classroom teachers of children who were receiving remedial help. Included in this number were 70 elementary school teachers, 32 junior high school teachers, and 21 vocational high school teachers. The data gathered through these interviews provide the basis of the regular classroom teachers' evaluation of the project, discussed below.

Of the personnel appointed to this project 93 teachers (42 elementary, 38 junior high, and 13 vocational high school teachers) were also interviewed. They represented approximately 20 percent of the personnel of the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools." Of these teachers interviewed 83 (80 percent) were engaged in corrective reading instruction.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT (ILOR)

Project personnel and children were observed during 104 lessons: 47 at the elementary school level, 42 at the junior high school level, and 15 at the vocational high school level. Of the 104 lessons observed, 81 were reading lessons and 23 were in other areas. Each observer rated the lesson observed according to: the composition of the student group, the physical environment, the atmosphere of the lesson, and aspects of both teacher and pupil functioning. Each observer also was asked to predict the academic progress the group would make by virtue of the remediation being offered.

Because the vast majority of the lessons observed were in the area of reading, the focus of these findings will necessarily be the reading lessons themselves, though the results generally apply as well to the "other" areas.

A. ASPECTS OF LESSON AND STUDENT GROUP

In the following report, the percentages of elementary level lessons observed are marked[1]; those percentages of junior high level lessons observed are designated by[2]; and those of the vocational high school level by[3].

Typically, the remedial reading lesson, ranging from 20 to 120 minutes, lasted between 40 and 45 minutes (62 percent,[1] 90 percent,[2] 75 percent[3]). At the elementary school level, about two-thirds (64 percent) of the remedial reading groups had between one and nine children in them, with 26 percent having between ten and 19 children and 10 percent having between 20 and 29 children. At the other levels, the groups ranged from one to 29 pupils, but most frequently contained between ten and 19 children (52 percent or more,[2] 63 percent[3]).

Most groups at the elementary and junior high school level seemed to be relatively homogeneous, that is, the children were no more than one year apart in level of functioning (65 percent,[1] 75 percent[2]). Nevertheless, in 35 percent of the groups[1] there was considerable heterogeneity, with groups ranging in ability from first to fourth grade level. Similarly, about 25 percent of the groups[2] contained children whose level of functioning extended from the third to the ninth grade. At the vocational high school level, the groups were essentially heterogeneous (88 percent), with a span of four grades extending as low as the second grade level. Generally, the pupils were not divided into more than one instructional group (83 percent,[1] 66 percent,[2] 62 percent[3]), but when they were, three or four instructional groups were more frequent than two.

The observers estimated that the lesson being evaluated was completely typical of the normal functioning of the particular teaching unit (71 percent of the time,[1] 61 percent,[2] and 100 percent[3]). Ten percent[1] and 7 percent[2] were considered atypical, with the remainder considered a reasonable approximation.

B. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The observers reported that 67 percent[1] of the reading lessons were held in rooms primarily set up for the project and 33 percent[1] were not; 55 percent[2] of the rooms were set up for project classes, whereas 45 percent[2] were not. Of the vocational high school lessons observed, 38 percent were held in rooms set up for the project and 62 percent were not. These ratings were based on the availability of appropriate materials and the flexibility of the room set-up as opposed to the fact that any available empty room was being utilized.

Most observers felt that the classrooms were average or above average in appearance (78 percent,[1] 64 percent[2]). Only at the vocational high school level were these classrooms more often rated as "below average" or "unattractive" (62 percent).

Observers were asked to indicate the teaching aids or audiovisual materials used by the teacher during the lesson. Since more than one item could be reported, the percentages total over 100 percent. In the reading lessons, aids such as textbooks, newspapers, workbooks, and special program kits such as the SRA reading program were frequently employed (92 percent,[1] 39 percent,[2] 12 percent[3]). Pictures and posters were used (43 percent,[1] 16 percent,[2] 13 percent[3]). Duplicated sheets (16 percent,[1] 23 percent[2]), the chalkboard (12 percent,[1] 6 percent,[2] 12 percent[3]) and audiovisual equipment (5 percent,[1] 19 percent,[2] 12 percent[3]) were also observed. A number of observations showed no teaching aids used (10 percent,[1] 29 percent,[2] 50 percent[3]). Typically (85 percent,[1] 81 percent,[2] 50 percent[3]), the materials were specifically related to the particular skill or ability in which the children were deficient.

The atmosphere in the classroom was reported as being warm and congenial (84 percent,[1] 81 percent,[2] 100 percent[3]) whether or not there was discipline.

C. ASPECTS OF ELEMENTARY LEVEL OBSERVATIONS

1. Teacher Functioning

On the ILOR, observers were asked first to evaluate the teacher's expectation for the children and her use of praise and then to rate 17 aspects of the teaching process.

a. Expectations and Praise

Expectations could be rated in 32 of the 42 reading lessons observed. Based on their appraisal of class level observers felt that in 16 percent the teacher's expectations were too high for their students. Three percent were too low, and 81 percent were judged realistic.

Considering the extent of the teacher's attempt to praise her pupils in response to their classroom performance, in 67 percent of the reading lessons the observers felt that the teachers made an attempt to praise all or almost every pupil, and in an additional 8 percent of the lessons attempts were made to praise about half the pupils. On the other hand, in 25 percent of the lessons, either no praise was paid or less than half of the children received any praise from the teacher.

b. Teaching Process

The data for the 17 aspects of the teaching process studied appear in Table IV-1. Observers rated the lessons highly. For seven of the 17 aspects, half or more of the lessons (47 to 96 percent) were rated "above average" and for another six aspects at least one-third (33 to 41 percent) were rated "above average." The strongest rating, as indicated in this table, was for the teachers' verbal communication with the children. The lowest rating was for creativity and imagination.

The observers were asked to make five overall judgments of the lesson they saw: its general quality, its depth, the amount of material covered, the degree of planning and organization evidenced. General conclusions were that the lessons were "above average" in quality of instruction, depth, organization, and planning and "average" in material covered. Observers were also asked for ratings of the use of teacher aides and the status of the relationship between the teachers and pupils in the lessons, their communication in general, and the handling of questions. Similarly, the modal response for these aspects was "above average," except for the "average" mode given for the handling of questions. With regard to the question of continuity in teaching, the observers were asked to rate the extent to which the lesson 1. referred to earlier material; 2. established a foundation for a child's independent work; 3. established a foundation for future lessons; and 4. was appropriate to the child's age level. For each of these four aspects the observers reported a modal response of "average," that is, "some" opportunity for continuity was prevalent in the reading lessons.

Both adaptation of materials (47 percent) and individualization of instruction (41 percent) had modes of "above average," but one of two areas of weakness observed in these lessons was lack of adaptation of materials to the number of students, since 36 percent of the lessons were rated as "below average." That is, although often the teachers were dealing with small groups and were individualizing instruction, the observers felt that in one lesson in three an insufficient attempt was made to adapt the materials to the size of the group. Finally, the most dramatic weakness observed was that 66 percent or two-thirds

TABLE IV-1

OBSERVER RATING OF ILOR ASPECTS OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING LESSONS

Aspect of Teacher Functioning	N[a]	Percent			
		Above Average	Average	Below Average	Not Relevant
Teacher's verbal communication with children	42	96		04	
Teacher-pupil relationship	42	90		10	
Degree of planning	42	67	24	09	
Organization	41	67	22	10	
Use of teaching aids	41	55	25	09	11
Quality of instruction	42	50	29	21	
Adaption of materials to number of students	42	47	17	36	
Individualization of instruction	42	41	38	21	
Depth of instruction	42	38	36	22	04
Amount of material covered	41	34	41	14	11
Opportunity for continuity with future lessons	42	36	62	02	
Appropriateness to child's age level	42	33	64	03	
Reference to earlier material	42	33	53	14	
Handling of children's questions	40	18	22	11	49
Foundation for independent work	41	27	56	17	
Relationship to regular classwork	42	08	29	08	55
Creativity and imagination	42	10	24	66	

[a] When N is less than 42, some observers omitted this item.

of the lessons observed were rated as "below average" with respect to the creativity and imagination. Indeed, only 10 percent were rated as "above average." Thus, even under special program provisions, the lessons were generally stereotyped, conventional, and lacking in resourcefulness on the part of the teacher.

2. Children's Functioning

Within the ILOR there were seven items on which the observers were asked to rate children's functioning. The results appear in Table IV-2.

Overall, the data suggest that in general the children exhibited what the observers considered to be "above average" interest and enthusiasm, participation, understanding of the teacher's spoken word, relationship with other children, and relaxedness. Children's questioning and responding to questions were also examined. Although the modal response for children "volunteering in response to teacher's questions" was "above average," it was not overwhelmingly so, as it was for the first three criteria listed above. Spontaneous questioning, on the other hand, was quite infrequent and was rated "below average" by observers in 67 percent of the classes.

The lack of spontaneous asking of questions appears striking in view of the pleasant atmosphere of good communications, relaxation, and participation among the students already reported. This discrepancy suggests an area worthy of further investigation. It raises the question of whether by the third grade, for example, students have already learned that to ask a question carries with it more punishments than rewards.

3. Observers' Opinions

After completing their lesson observation and interviews with project teachers, classroom teachers, and principals, the observers were asked to give their opinions about the effect of continued participation in the type of remedial groups observed upon the academic achievement of students involved. Most (81 percent) expected progress: 35 percent felt that these pupils would show marked progress, and 46 percent said slight progress. The others (19 percent) felt there would be no change (18 percent) or that the pupils' academic achievement would be slightly worse (1 percent). Therefore, the most frequent observer estimate was slight progress.

D. JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL OBSERVATIONS

1. Teacher Functioning

a. Expectation and Praise

The reality of the teacher's expectations could be rated by observers in 29 of the 31 reading lessons observed. Based on their judgment of the ability level of the children, they felt that in

TABLE IV-2

RATINGS OF OBSERVERS ON ASPECTS OF CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING AT THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL DURING LESSONS IN READING

N = 42

		Percent			
Aspects of Children's Functioning	N[a]	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Not Relevant
1. Interest and enthusiasm	42	74	2	24	--
2. Overall participation	42	83	5	5	7
3. Understanding teacher's spoken word	41	95	2	2	--
4. Spontaneous questions	41	7	14	44	35
5. Volunteering in response to teacher's questions	41	47	27	7	19
6. Overall relationship among the children	39	61	36	3	--
7. Degree of relaxation among children	42	67	28	5	--

[a] When N is less than 42, some observers omitted this item.

7 percent the teacher's expectations seemed excessively high, 3 percent excessively low and 90 percent were realistic.

In 38 percent of the reading lessons teachers made attempts to praise all or almost every pupil; in 24 percent, half of the pupils were praised, and in 40 percent, less than half of the pupils were praised.

In terms of the teacher's informing pupils of their progress, 8 percent made limited or no critical evaluation of their students, whereas 92 percent offered encouragement in terms of specific criteria or suggestions for improvement.

b. Teaching Process

Results obtained at the junior high school level on ratings of teaching process were quite similar to those found on the elementary school level. (See Table IV-3.) For 12 of the 17 aspects, 45 percent or more of the ratings were "above average," with the teachers' verbal communication with the children considered "above average" in 100 percent of the reading lessons. Teacher-pupil relationships were also extremely high, rated "above average" by observers in 91 percent of the classes. "Above average" ratings were given almost 50 percent of the time to aspects such as depth, planning, organization and reference to earlier material. In "adaptation of material to the number of students" 55 percent of the classes were rated "above average."

Also similar to the elementary level data was the relatively poor rating given to the teachers' handling of children's questions. Observers in more than half of the lessons (57 percent) indicated no opportunity for questioning. About half the time this was because the subject content was neither meaningful nor appropriate for the pupils and about half the time it was because the teacher dominated the lesson, not giving pupils a chance to ask questions.

Furthermore, as at the elementary level, creativity and imagination in the preparation of lessons was rated "below average" by observers in more than 50 percent of the lessons. Again, this refers to the issue of the stereotyped, traditional approaches to the teaching of material even in small remedial classes.

2. Children's Functioning

The same seven items within the ILOR with which the observers rated children's functioning in the elementary schools were used as criteria for children's functioning at the junior high school level. The results appear in Table IV-4.

Four of the seven aspects of children's functioning were rated as "above average." Observers in all the reading classes rated pupils' "understanding of the teacher's spoken word" as "above average."

TABLE IV-3

OBSERVER RATINGS OF ILOR ASPECTS OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL READING LESSONS

N = 31[a]

Aspect of Teacher Functioning	N	Percent			
		Above Average	Average	Below Average	Not Relevant
Use of teaching aids	30	34	16	16	34
Adaptation of materials to number of students	31	55	16	29	--
Amount of material covered	30	44	27	16	13
Handling of children's questions	30	16	24	3	57
Depth of instruction	30	47	33	17	3
Teacher's verbal communication with children	30	100	--	--	--
Degree of planning	31	55	42	3	--
Teacher-pupil relationship	31	91	6	3	--
Organization	31	65	32	3	--
Quality of instruction	31	45	32	23	--
Creativity and imagination	30	10	37	53	--
Reference to earlier material	31	46	29	19	6
Foundation for independent work	30	40	37	16	3
Individualization of instruction	31	48	36	16	--
Appropriate to child's age level	31	26	68	6	--
Opportunity for continuity with future lessons	31	45	48	7	--
Relationship to regular classwork	27	7	30	30	33

---

[a] When N is less than 31, some observers omitted this item.

TABLE IV-4

RATINGS OF OBSERVERS ON ASPECTS OF CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL DURING LESSONS IN READING

N = 31

		Percent			
Aspects of Children's Functioning	N	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Not Relevant
1. Interest and enthusiasm	31	58	10	32	--
2. Overall participation	31	70	10	10	10
3. Understanding teacher's spoken word	31	100	--	--	--
4. Spontaneous questions	31	--	6	42	52
5. Volunteering in response to teacher's questions	31	25	17	17	41
6. Overall relationship among the children	30[a]	37	60	3	--
7. Degree of relaxation among children	31	74	26	--	--

[a] One observer omitted this item.

Children were generally considered to be relaxed, with observers in 74 percent of the classes rating relaxation as "above average." Although "interest and enthusiasm" ratings were "above average" in 58 percent of the classes, this rating was not quite as high as on the elementary school level.

Three aspects of student participation were examined: "overall participation," "volunteering in response to teacher's questions," and "spontaneous questions." Overall participation was judged to be "above average" by more than three-quarters of the observers. Although observers in 42 percent of the classes deemed "volunteering in response to teacher's questions" irrelevant, the modal response for the remaining classes was "above average." As on the elementary school level, however, spontaneous questioning was deemed "below average" in a vast majority of classes (87 percent) in which the criterion was considered relevant.

This lack of spontaneous questioning is odd in view of the pleasant atmosphere, good communication, interest, relaxation, and participation so positively reported, and therefore merits further investigation, just as it does on the elementary level discussed earlier. It might be partially explained, however, by the nature of remedial reading instruction, per se.

3. Observers' Opinions

In 50 percent of the classes, observers predicted that continued participation in remedial groups would result in a slight improvement of pupils' academic achievement. Observers in 29 percent of the classes felt that marked progress would be the outcome, whereas those in 21 percent failed to see any change forthcoming or felt the pupils' academic achievement might drop.

E. VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS

1. Teacher Functioning

a. Expectation and Praise

Reality of teacher expectations of students could be rated by observers in seven of the 15 classes, as before, based on the observers' judgment of children's ability levels. Generally, expectations were considered to be realistic (72 percent), with expectations "too high" in 28 percent of the classes.

Observers in 74 percent of the classes said that teachers offered the student some evaluation criteria by which he could judge his progress. In most classes (60 percent) at least half of the students were praised.

b. Teaching Process

As on the elementary and the junior high school levels, observers' rating of aspects of teacher functioning were quite high, with 11 of the 17 aspects receiving modal ratings of "above average." (See Table IV-5.) Likewise, the highest number of "above average" ratings were given to the same aspects as on the other levels: teacher-pupil relationship (93 percent) and teacher's verbal communications with the pupils (87 percent). This latter aspect of the teaching process received a slightly higher rating in reading classes, however, with teachers in all of the eight classes receiving "above average" ratings as compared with only five of the seven teachers in "other" classes. The remaining two teachers of "other" classes received "below average" ratings. On the other hand, both "handling of children's questions" and "appropriateness to age level" were rated slightly more favorably in the reading classes than in the "other" classes. Those criteria receiving "average" modal ratings involved three aspects of the general quality of the lesson: "degree of planning" (67 percent), "organization" (67 percent) and "amount of material covered" (43 percent), and two aspects of continuity in teaching: "reference to earlier material" (52 percent) and "appropriateness to the child's age level" (52 percent). "Creativity and imagination" received the lowest ratings, as on the other levels, having been rated "below average" by the observers in 67 percent of the classes.

2. Children's Functioning

A discrepancy similar to that found on the elementary and junior high school levels appears in the observers' ratings of children's functioning. (See Table IV-6.) First, an extremely large number of "above average" ratings were given to "understanding of the teacher's spoken word" (93 percent) and "degree of relaxation" (87 percent), with modal ratings of "above average" also given to "interest and enthusiasm" (67 percent), "overall participation" (67 percent), and "overall relationship among the pupils" (67 percent). Children in reading classes were not rated quite as high on "interest and enthusiasm" as those in "other" classes. In the reading classes, a bimodal rating was given "interest and enthusiasm," with half the responses being "above average" and half "below average." In the "other" classes, six of the seven responses were "above average" and one "below average."

Yet, "below average" modal ratings were not only given "spontaneous questioning" (89 percent) as in the other sections, but also "volunteering in response to teacher's questions" (56 percent). Although the reasons given for these "below average" ratings were that the lessons were neither meaningful nor appropriate for the pupils, and that the teacher dominated the classroom, it would seem that this discrepancy merits further examination. First, the combination of "overall participation" "above average" with neither spontaneous questioning nor volunteering in response to teachers' questions suggests confusion on these items within the instrument or the observer's

TABLE IV-5

OBSERVERS' RATINGS OF ILOR ASPECTS OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL READING AND OTHER LESSONS

N = 15

		Percent			
Aspect of Teacher Functioning	N[a]	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Not Relevant
Use of teaching aids	15	34	6	26	34
Adaptation of materials to number of students	15	46	33	20	--
Amount of material covered	14	36	43	21	--
Handling of children's questions	15	40	26	--	34
Depth of instruction	15	46	40	13	--
Teacher-pupil relationship	15	93	--	6	--
Teacher's verbal communication with children	15	87	--	13	--
Degree of planning	15	33	67	--	--
Organization	15	33	67	--	--
Quality of instruction	15	52	27	20	--
Creativity and imagination	15	13	20	67	--
Reference to earlier material	15	46	52	--	--
Foundation for independent work	15	40	27	27	6
Individualization of instruction	8	38	25	37	--
Appropriateness to child's age level	15	40	52	6	--
Appropriateness for continuing with future lessons	15	60	40	--	--
Relation to regular classwork	13	39	24	7	30

[a] When N is less than 15, some observers omitted this item.

TABLE IV-6

RATINGS OF OBSERVERS ON ASPECTS OF CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING AT THE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL DURING READING AND OTHER LESSONS

		Percent			
Aspect	N	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Not Relevant
Interest and enthusiasm	15	67	00	33	--
Overall participation	15	67	00	33	--
Understanding teacher's spoken word	15	93	00	6	--
Spontaneous questions	15	6	00	54	40
Volunteering in response to teacher's questions	15	13	13	33	41
Overall relationship among pupils	15	67	27	6	--
Degree of relaxedness	15	87	13	00	--

judgments. Second, if interest and enthusiasm are high, pupils understand the teacher's spoken word, are relaxed, and have a good relationship with each other, why should spontaneous questioning and volunteering answers be so infrequent? This is a point worth inquiry, if the instrumental and judgmental explanations are ruled out.

3. Observers' Opinions

Observers in most classes (87 percent) predicted pupil progress as a result of continued remedial groups; the majority predicted "slight progress" (54 percent), while "marked progress" was predicted by 33 percent.

F. SUMMARY OF ILOR DATA

The ILOR data describe in depth the mechanics of project grouping (size of instructional group, level of functioning, length of instructional lesson, etc.) and the classroom atmosphere in terms of physical environment, materials, and the psychological milieu. They also provide information on the functioning of the project teachers, the children's functioning, and projections as to the ultimate value of the remediation offered in this project.

It would appear that the project classes are functioning within the guidelines established in the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools" proposal. Children who were retarded in their reading achievement were receiving instruction in small groups. Observers felt that, for the most part, teaching facilities were adequate and that classrooms were attractive and pleasant.

Teachers appeared to have established excellent communication with the children, and the tone of the lessons was warm and congenial. Aside from the rather stereotyped manner of presentation, the quality of teaching was good and, exclusive of the issue of pupil response to and raising of questions, pupil participation was also good.

The observers felt that such remedial reading instruction would ultimately prove valuable for most of the children receiving such instruction.

In summary, then, our observers evaluated the remedial reading classes being conducted as part of the project positively.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: ATTENDANCE AND READING ACHIEVEMENT

A. ATTENDANCE DATA

Attendance records of 3,790 children participating in the project were analyzed for the school years 1968-1969[1] and 1967-1968, as well as a selected sample of comparison data for grades four and seven of 334 children not in the project. An attempt was made to determine whether children participating in the project showed a significant improvement in school attendance, possibly as a reflection of a better attitude toward school. Analysis of attendance grade by grade yielded four changes that were significant beyond .01 level:[2] two positive and two negative. Children in the present fifth grade averaged (median) 29 absences in 1968-69 as compared to only 18 in 1967-68 when they were in the fourth grade, and in the present eighth grade there was an increase of about nine additional absences over their 1967-68 (seventh grade) attendance. Therefore, there was an overall drop in attendance in these two grades. In contrast, children in the sixth grade in 1968-69 showed an improvement of seven days over their attendance in the fifth grade in 1967-68, and there was an improvement in the present seventh grade over the sixth grade of six days.

Our comparison sample data show improvement in attendance for fourth and seventh grade children from 1967-68 to 1968-69, with both grades showing a reduction in number of absences of nine days for the academic year.

It consequently becomes clear that the absence of significant change in attendance for most grades and the random changes in others provide no evidence that a child's participation in the project changed his attitude toward school as reflected in his attendance record.

B. READING ACHIEVEMENT

Two comparisons were made between the reading achievement of children receiving remedial instruction with the group of comparison children not receiving such instruction. Table V-1 presents the current level of reading achievement of the children in both the

---

[1] Attendance data are based on the number of absences during the academic year. No child was considered to be absent during the period of the strike and this, of course, minimizes the number of absences possible in 1968-69.

[2] Median test using Chi^2.

TABLE V-1

CURRENT STATUS IN READING, IN QUARTILES, BY CURRENT GRADE, PROGRAM AND COMPARISON CHILDREN, FOR 1969

	Current Grade													
	Program											Comparison		
Percentile	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4	7
75	2.2	3.0	3.5	4.2	5.2	6.7	7.0	6.1	8.2	8.4	6.9	3.4	4.2	5.7
50	1.8	2.4	3.1	3.7	4.4	5.5	5.8	5.3	6.7	6.6	6.5	2.5	3.7	4.8
25	1.6	2.1	2.7	3.2	3.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.2	5.6	5.5	2.1	3.2	4.2
Number of children	68	344	222	221	178	25	112	144	25	51	24	88	119	79

project and comparison group based on citywide administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in April 1969. At this time, the normal reading expectation for a child would be the grade level plus seven months (i.e., a reading grade of 4.7 in the fourth grade). It must be recognized that standardized reading tests do not allow for a curtailed school year such as New York City experienced in 1968-69 when children attended school for only four and one-half rather than seven months. Obviously, some loss of achievement would be expected.

In the three grades for which data were available for comparison children, severe retardation was evident. The median third grader was 1.2 years below normal, the median fourth grader, a year, and the median seventh grader, 2.9 years below expectation. Even the children at the 75th percentile were reading below average. In comparison, the children in the program were as far below normal (-1.3 years) as the comparison children at grade three, a half year worse in grade four (-1.6 years), and eight months better in grade seven (-2.2 years). This inconsistent pattern suggests no differences, overall, between the two groups of children.

Retardation characterized all the other grades for which data were available for the project children, with deficiencies averaging about two years in the elementary years, rising to three years in grade eight, four years in grades nine and ten, and five years in grades 11 and 12. The smaller sample at these upper years must be recognized, but even allowing for sampling error, the retardation is severe and far greater than a curtailed school year would explain.

Some insight into what progress was achieved during the 1968-69 school year is provided by the second analysis presented in Table V-2 of the reading achievement data, based on the change in children's reading levels from April 1968 to April 1969. This interval might have been expected to produce an average gain of one year in reading achievement for the project's participants. The comparison children never achieved more than half of this gain and in grade seven there was only a median change of three months. Moreover, a third of the seventh grade comparison children (31 percent) actually showed a decrease in their recorded reading level when 1969 was compared to 1968, as did 19 percent of the fourth graders and 2 percent of the third graders. In these same three grades, the median change for the children in the program was higher than that recorded for the comparison children--only one month higher in grade three, but three months higher in grade four and six months higher in grade seven. Moreover, in grades four and seven, many fewer program than comparison children showed declines, 8 percent compared to 19 percent in grade four and 24 percent compared to 31 percent in grade seven.[1]

---

[1] Across the grades, between 19 percent and 40 percent of the program children gained the expected year or more, with the largest percentage increase occurring at grade four and the smallest at grade five.

TABLE V-2

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WITH INDICATED CHANGE IN READING LEVEL 1968-69; BY CURRENT GRADE, PROGRAM AND CONTROL CHILDREN

	Percentage of Children in Program							Percentage of Control Children		
	Current Grade							Current Grade		
Change	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	3	4	7
3.1 to 4.5	1	*	1	1	12	5	6	2	-	-
2.5 to 3.0	1	1	*	2	9	5	6	-	-	2
2.0 to 2.4	1	1	2	2	8	6	2	5	4	2
1.6 to 1.9	4	10	2	7	5	2	4	4	8	15
1.0 to 1.5	21	28	14	16	15	20	20	12	27	8
.7 to .9	19	17	15	12	4	6	6	20	8	13
.4 to .6	26	15	17	11	9	21	23	24	12	18
.1 to .3	22	18	16	12	7	3	9	26	16	12
0	2	2	12	8	7	10	2	5	6	9
- .1 to - .3	1	6	11	6	6	11	6	2	14	10
- .4 to - .6	1	2	6	9	2	7	6	-	4	13
- .7 to - .9	1	-	1	6	9	3	4	-	1	5
-1.0 to -2.2	*	-	3	8	7	2	6	-	-	3
Median change	+.6	+.8	+.4	+.4	+.9	+.5	+.5	+.5	+.5	+.3
Number of children	349	319	292	159	54	87	48	62	104	63

*Some, but less than 1 percent.

Overall, the data in Table V-2 present no evidence of dramatic change in reading level by the project children except for the near normal progress of those in grades four and seven. However, when compared to the comparison samples, the program children did show some differential improvement.

The data presented in the two tables suggest that the project children began behind the comparison children, for despite their greater gain from 1968 to 1969, they were still reading no better.

These data need much further attention, especially when viewed in the context of the positive evaluation given the remedial instruction by program observers, principals, and teachers. Further investigation is needed to explore the discrepancy between the evaluation of the teaching process and the lack of concrete improvement in children's measured ability to read.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS, PROJECT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

The structured interviews with principals, project personnel, and regular classroom teachers in the sample schools were individually administered, and all responses were recorded by the evaluation staff. The interviews were designed to secure information and perceptions about three major points: 1. the implementation of the project; 2. the dynamics of the project; and 3. the evaluation of the program.

The results are presented below by major focus and then by school level. The responses of the three groups of school personnel interviewed are presented together for purposes of comparison.

A. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

1. Additional Positions

a. Elementary School Level

At the elementary school level, 188 additional positions were to be allocated to 191 New York City schools. All positions were to be assigned and filled in September 1968. According to the listing submitted to our researchers by the New York City Board of Education, the plan was carried out as stated.

Isolating the 42 schools comprising the random sample, a total of 42 positions (one per school) were to have been provided for the program.

Of the 41 principals who were interviewed, 16 (39 percent) reported that additional positions were actually allocated to their schools. Twelve (29 percent) reported that no additional personnel had been received but that persons already on staff had been transferred to the project. Thirteen (32 percent) reported knowing of no personnel changes whatsoever as a result of this project.

Yet, the 16 principals who indicated that additional personnel were assigned to their schools seemed confused as to the nature of the project. Many reported first that project personnel began their positions far before the implementation of the project, and second, that the number of personnel reported per school was far above that assigned per school by the Board of Education.

Thus, these principals reported having received a total of 65 additional teachers instead of 16, an average of approximately four per school as compared with one per school reported assigned by the

Board of Education.

Of the 65 positions reported by these 16 principals, 16 were in remedial reading. One of these 16 was reportedly received in 1967, however, and cannot, therefore, be a part of this project. Of the remaining 15, ten (67 percent) began their services as scheduled in September 1968. Two (14 percent) were assigned to the school in September yet did not begin work until later in the year. The remaining two (14 percent) were assigned to work and began in February 1969. Of the two positions received in guidance, one began in September 1968 and the other in February 1969. One position in remedial math and 16 positions in shop began in February 1969. Finally, 30 positions were listed in the "other category" which represents regular classroom teachers, speech teachers, and parent aides. Four of these began in 1967 and were not, therefore, a part of this program. Eleven began in September 1968, and 15 in February 1969.

In addition, the 12 principals who reported having transferred incumbent personnel to the project reported transferring a total of 14 personnel to the project. One of these was reported transferred in February 1966, one and one-half years before this project was begun.

b. Junior High School Level

At the junior high school level, 202 additional Title I positions were to be allocated to 150 schools; 67 for corrective reading teachers and 135 for remediation in math and allied subject areas. According to the listing by the New York City Board of Education, the program was carried out as stated. Isolating the 28 schools comprising the random sample, a total of 39.6 positions were allocated, of which only 28.6 were filled. In interviewing the project personnel, however, it was found that six personnel named by the Board of Education had been replaced by other persons, 12 vacancies had been filled, and three positions had been added.

Of the 28 principals interviewed, 27 responded to questions concerning personnel changes in their schools as a result of this project. From their responses it would seem that the assignment of new personnel, as outlined in the project proposal, was carried out in only 11 of the 27 junior high schools (41 percent). In eight of the schools, no additional personnel were received, but persons already on staff were transferred to the project. In the remaining eight schools, no personnel changes were made as a result of the project.

Principals first estimated that a total of 10.4 new positions had been allocated to their schools. When asked to specify actual positions held by these personnel, however, they accounted for 26.3 positions allocated, and 16.2 positions received. Nine of these received positions were in remedial reading, 7.6 assigned and received in September 1968 and 1.4 assigned and received in February 1968. In addition, 4.8 positions were assigned in services to the deprived.

Three of the 4.8 were received in September 1968. In the "other" category 7.4 positions were assigned, with 4.2 received in September 1968.

Principals reported a total of 12 additional positions filled by transferring personnel already employed by the school to a project position.

Only 12 of the 27 principals interviewed reported that auxiliary personnel had been assigned to their schools. The positions filled by these 12 personnel were: four assistants (paraprofessionals), five guidance counselors, two specialized teachers and one, a medical staff member.[1]

Only 24 of the 38 personnel interviewed were able to describe their position in the project, and six of these described positions that could not possibly be a part of the program, that is, the position of "regular classroom teacher." Only 18, therefore, of the 38 (40 percent) could claim valid positions in the program. Eleven of these 18 were corrective reading teachers, four were remedial teachers for other academic areas, two were coordinators, and one taught English as a second language.

c. Vocational High School Level

The 20 vocational high schools in the program were to receive an additional 143 Title I positions, including supportive personnel: psychiatrists, social workers, and guidance counselors.

Isolating the seven vocational high schools in the random sample a total of 48 teaching positions were supposedly received for this project. Thirteen of these project teachers were interviewed by the research staff.

Four (31 percent) of these personnel, although listed as project personnel by the Board of Education, obviously were unaware of their positions in this program, since they answered that they had been fully participating in the program for a longer period of time than the program had been in existence. One of the four answered that he had been fully participating in the program for three years, two for two and one-half years, and one since March 1968.

Only four of the personnel (31 percent) were actually participating in the program for its entire duration, having begun in September 1968. The five remaining personnel began their positions in January 1969.

Unlike their counterparts in the elementary and junior high schools, the majority of whom were remedial reading teachers, the majority of the personnel in the vocational high schools were specific subject teachers in areas other than reading. This was true of eight (62 percent) of the personnel interviewed. Only two (5 percent) of the personnel interviewed on the vocational high school level were corrective reading teachers. The remaining three personnel interviewed were coordinators.

---

[1] These positions were not all full-time assignments in one school.

According to the seven vocational high school principals interviewed, the program was not carried out nearly as extensively as reported by the Board of Education. Only two of the seven principals interviewed reported that they had received additional personnel as a result of this program. Three of the remaining principals reported that they had transferred persons already on staff to the project. Finally, one of the principals reported no personnel changes whatsoever as a result of the project, and one principal did not respond to the question.

The total number of personnel assigned to these schools, then, according to the principals was far smaller than the number listed as having been assigned by the Board of Education. Principals reported having been assigned a total of ten positions; two in reading, four in remedial math, one in services to the deprived, and three in shop. Of the ten positions assigned to these schools, only six were received, one in reading, one in math, one in services to the deprived, and three in shop. Adding these six received positions to the total of 14 personnel transferred to this project, one arrives at a total of 20 personnel for these seven schools, as compared to the figure of 48 presented by the Board of Education.

Principals reported that 85 additional personnel were needed in order for the program to function effectively. This, added to the 20 used this year, totals 105 personnel needed for the program's effective functioning. This represents need for a greater than five-fold increase of personnel in comparison with the personnel actually received this year. All schools reported need for additional reading personnel. The stated need was 30 (35 percent) of the total personnel requested. The modal response was five reading personnel needed per school, and the range was from one to seven. Five of the principals reported need for guidance personnel--the range being from one to four per school and the mode, one per school. Of total personnel needed, guidance represented 11 (13 percent of the total). Six schools reported need for a total of 17 remedial math instructors (20 percent of the total). Numbers of personnel needed per school ranged from one to five, with a mode of two. Three principals reported a need for personnel for services to the deprived and shop personnel (with one of each needed per school).

Only one of the principals reported that auxiliary personnel had been assigned to his school this year. The auxiliary personnel assigned to this school were generally paraprofessional help.

2. Notification of Participation

a. Elementary School Level

Of the 36 principals who reported when they were informed of the fact that their schools were participants in the project (Table VI-1) most (45 percent) reported that they were informed either before the project proposal was submitted in August 1968 or four to seven months after the project was designated to begin. Over one-third of the principals and almost one-seventh of the project personnel in these designated project schools were "never" informed of this project.

Of the 22 principals who reported that they were informed about the project 14 (63 percent) said they were informed by the district office. Other sources of information were the Board of Education (five or 23 percent), the Center for Urban Education Evaluation Director (two or 10 percent) and a principals' meeting (one or 4 percent).

Results were similar for responses as to when the project personnel began full participation in the project (Table VI-2). Fifty-five percent of the personnel indicated that participation in the project began before the proposal was submitted or months prior to the termination of the project. Ten percent expressed no awareness of this project.

These seemingly confused responses on the part of principals and project personnel as to the implementation of the project might be due to the fact that they considered the project as part of the usual corrective reading program which has been established in some project schools for as long as ten years. Perhaps the fact that most (77 percent) of the principals had neither seen nor been sent a copy of the project proposal explains the ambiguity.

b. Junior High School Level

In examining data presented by principals, it should be noted that at the junior high school level too, most (68 percent) of the principals had never seen a copy of the project proposal. Furthermore, only 14 (50 percent) of the principals interviewed had ever been officially informed that their school was designated as a participant in the project. Two of the 14 principals were notified before September 1968. Five were notified in September 1968. The remaining seven were notified as late as January or February 1969.

Of the 14 principals and 29 project personnel (at all levels) who reported that they were informed of the fact that their schools were participants in the project before the project (Table VI-1), most were informed four to seven months after the project should have begun. It might be assumed, since so few of the principals and project personnel were notified of their participation in the project, that there was no standard notification procedure. Thus, junior high school principals

TABLE VI-1

DATES ON WHICH THE PRINCIPALS AND PROJECT TEACHERS WERE INFORMED ABOUT THE "PROGRAM TO IMPROVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS" AT THE ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

		Informed Before Project				Informed After Project				Never Informed			
		Before Jan. 1968		From Jan. 1968- June 1968		From Sept 1968- Dec. 1968		From Jan. 1969- April 1969					
Level	Staff	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	Total N	Total Percent
Elementary	Principal	7	20	3	8	6	17	6	17	14	38	36	100
	Project-teacher	9	24	5	14	7	19	11	29	5	14	37	100
Junior high school	Principal	-	-	2	14	5	36	7	50	-	-	14	100
	Project-teacher	4	14	8	27	2	7	10	35	5	17	29	100
Vocational high school	Principal	-	-	2	33	2	33	2	34	-	-	6	100
	Project-teacher	2	22	1	11	1	11	4	45	1	11	9	100

TABLE VI-2

DATES WHEN FULL PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT WAS INITIATED IN THE ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL ACCORDING TO PROJECT TEACHERS

	Elementary		Junior High		Vocational	
Dates	**N**	**Percent**	**N**	**Percent**	**N**	**Percent**
Before September 1968	11	30	5	19	4	31
September 1968-December 1968	13	35	7	27	4	31
January 1969-June 1969	9	25	9	35	5	38
Don't know	2	5	4	15	-	--
Still not fully participating	2	5	1	4	-	--
Totals	37	100	26	100	13	100

were notified from various sources of their participation in the program, the largest number (57 percent) having been notified by the Board of Education. The other sources of notification were the District Office (36 percent) and the Center for Urban Education (14 percent).

Similar responses occurred when the project personnel were asked when they began full participation in the project. Of the 26 responding project teachers, nine began participation only a few months before the termination of the project. Although officially listed by the Board of Education as project personnel, five either did not know about it or were still not fully participating. Since almost one-fifth stated participation before the inception of the project, perhaps they were merely performing the same jobs they had been performing for years.

c. Vocational High School Level

As was the case for elementary and for junior high schools, more than half of the vocational high school principals never saw a copy of the project proposal, and some were informed of the project as late as as February 1969. Thus, of the seven principals, four had never seen a copy of the project proposal. One of the seven principals had never been officially informed that his school was participating in the program. Two of the principals were informed in June 1968, two were informed in September 1968, and two were informed as late as February 1969. (See Table VI-1.) Three of the six principals who were informed of their participation in the program were so informed by the Board of Education, one by the District Office, one by the Center for Urban Education Evaluation Director, and the remaining principal could not report the manner in which he was informed.

Nine of the 13 project personnel answered as to when they were informed of this project. Of these nine, only one was informed before, and one at the beginning of the project (between September 1968 and December 1968). Four were informed of the project between January 1969 and April 1969. The rest of the personnel either were never informed of the project or claimed to have been informed long before planning for the project began, and therefore were informed of a project other than the one being evaluated. One respondent reported having been informed of the project two and one-half years before.

The suggestion of a "non-project" is reinforced by examining the date on which project personnel were assigned to fully participate in the project. Of the 13 personnel interviewed, only four were participating as scheduled, that is, between September and December 1968. However, nine claimed to have been participating either long before planning for or after implementation of this project occurred.

3. Training and Experience of Project Personnel

Two aspects of preparation of the project personnel for their positions were examined: first, special training received for this position, and second experience and background in teaching.

a. Elementary School Level

For the 42 teachers in the elementary schools studied, training consisted primarily of graduate courses (45 percent) and inservice courses (43 percent). Other training received included college and undergraduate courses (14 percent) and district workshops (12 percent). This information was substantiated by the principals, since 18 of the 24 responding principals answered that the corrective reading teachers had special training. A consensus of four principals was that guidance personnel and personnel providing services to the deprived did not have special training, while remedial math instructors and "others" did.

The most common type of license held by project personnel was the common branches license held by 38 (92 percent) of the teachers. One had an early childhood license, one had a junior high school license, and one had a high school license.

There was a marked difference in total years of teaching experience between regular teachers interviewed and project teachers. The modal response for the former group was between one and four years teaching (usually at the same school in which currently employed), with a mean of 7.5 years, while the modal response for the latter group was over 20 years teaching experience with the mean number of years experience being 17.85.

b. Junior High School Level

Of the 32 responding project personnel, 23 (70 percent) said they received specialized training for their positions. Graduate college courses were listed most frequently (83 percent), followed by inservice courses (78 percent), college undergraduate courses in specific subject areas (26 percent), and district workshops (22 percent).

Principals reported 28 positions filled by this project including not only new personnel, but personnel transferred from other positions. They estimated that 18 of these 28 persons (67 percent) had special training for their positions. Specifically, principals reported special training received by nine of the 13 corrective reading teachers, all three of the guidance personnel, four of the five personnel providing services to the deprived, and two of the four personnel in "other" positions. None of the personnel in remedial math or in shop were said to have special training.

The most common type of license held by the project personnel at the junior high school level was a junior high school license (55 percent), with the second most frequently held license a common branches license (26 percent). High school and early childhood licenses were also held by 15 percent and 3 percent, respectively.

There was a marked difference in the mean years of teaching experience for project personnel and for regular classroom teachers, 12 years of teaching for the former and seven years for the latter.

c. Vocational High School Level

Only ten of the 21 project personnel answered as to whether they had had specialized training in the area to which they were assigned for the project. Seven of the ten reported that they had graduate college courses, and in addition, three had inservice courses, and one, an undergraduate course in a specific subject area.

Of six principals responding as to special training for the reading teachers, three said they had received it. Only three principals responded as to the special training of the remedial math instructors, with one answer in the affirmative. The one principal each who responded as to special training for the personnel dealing with services to the deprived or in shop answered in the negative.

The license most commonly held by project personnel was the high school license, held by nine (69 percent) of the personnel.

Although the modal number of years teaching experience was the same for both project personnel and for regular classroom teachers (between one and four years), the mean number of years teaching experience for project personnel was one year higher (7.5) than that for regular classroom teachers (6.6).

4. Criteria for Selection of Project Personnel[1]

a. Elementary School Level

Teaching experience and ability in the classroom were, according to eight principals (53 percent), the major criteria for selection of project teachers. That the teacher had previously functioned in this role was the second most frequently noted criterion (33 percent); one principal each mentioned the fact of volunteering, and the teacher having been trained in the specific subject area. Personnel were generally selected by the school administrative staff, except for a few selected by the district superintendent's office, the parents and community.

---

[1] The variation in numbers in this section reflects variation in number who responded. The referent number given refers to the number of respondents to the question being discussed.

b. Junior High School Level

Each of the nine respondent junior high school principals said that selection was based upon the teacher's experience and ability in the classroom, or because teachers had previously functioned in the same type of role, thus supporting the findings that many personnel were continuing work they had been doing for years. All principals said project teachers were hired by school administrative staff.

c. Vocational High School Level

Only two of the seven principals responded that the teacher's experience and ability in the classroom were the criteria by which project personnel were selected. Four of the principals said personnel were selected by school administrative staff.

5. Selection of Children

Principals, project personnel, and classroom teachers were asked how the children were selected to participate in this project (Table VI-3, VI-4, VI-5). Multiple criteria were mentioned by most of the people interviewed.

a. Elementary School Level

Recommendation from both the classroom and specialized teachers was the most frequently mentioned criterion for pupil selection by 32 principals, 22 project personnel, and 43 classroom teachers. Both project personnel and classroom teachers considered standardized tests (such as the Metropolitan Achievement Test) as the second most frequent method of pupil selection, whereas principals indicated selection of pupils by school principals and assistant principals.

It was estimated by 18 of the 39 (46 percent) project personnel that none of the children in their classes had received previous remedial instruction. Four (10 percent) of the personnel said that one or two of the children in their classes had had previous remedial instruction, and 11 (28 percent) of the personnel estimated that less than half of the class had had previous remedial instruction. Only six (16 percent) of the personnel felt that more than half of the class had had previous remedial instruction, and none of the personnel said that this was true of all of the children.

TABLE VI-3

METHODS OF PUPIL SELECTION ACCORDING TO PRINCIPALS OF ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

	Elementary		Junior High		Vocational	
Methods of Selection	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Principal and assistant principal	14	22	3	12	0	0
Classroom teacher	17	27	3	12	1	25
Guidance counselor	2	3	5	20	1	25
District reading coordinator	1	2	0	0	0	0
Specialized teachers	15	23	5	20	0	0
Level of achievement	6	9	2	8	0	0
Standardized tests	9	14	5	20	2	50
Non-English speaking pupils	0	0	1	4	0	0
Emotional problems	0	0	1	4	0	0
Totals	64	100	25	100	4	100
Number of respondents	41		16		2	

TABLE VI-4

METHODS OF PUPIL SELECTION ACCORDING TO PROJECT PERSONNEL AT THE ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

	Elementary		Junior High		Vocational	
Methods of Selection	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
By standardized test scores	20	27	12	39	11	67
By informal test scores	12	17	2	6	1	7
Teacher recommendation	22	30	9	29	3	19
Principal's recommendation	2	3	0	0	0	0
Previously in CRT program	2	3	0	0	0	0
Two years or more below average in reading ability	14	19	4	13	1	7
Children with emotional problems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Language difficulty	1	1	4	13	0	0
Totals	73	100	31	100	16	100
Number of respondents	37		30		7	

TABLE VI-5

METHODS OF PUPIL SELECTION ACCORDING TO CLASSROOM TEACHERS AT ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

	Elementary		Junior High		Vocational	
Methods of Selection	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
By corrective reading teacher	16	15	10	25	0	0
Standardized test scores	18	17	9	23	17	60
Informal test scores	8	8	0	0	0	0
Classroom teacher	27	26	3	8	2	7
Guidance counselor	0	0	3	8	8	29
Children non-English speaking	0	0	3	8	0	0
All children same program last year	10	10	0	0	0	0
Deficient in reading skills	23	22	2	5	0	0
No report	2	2	9	23	1	4
Totals	104	100	39	100	28	100
Number of respondents	63		32		12	

b. Junior High School Level

Multiple criteria too were used in the selection of children to take part in the program at the junior high school level. Classroom and specialized teacher recommendations were mentioned as the primary criteria of selection by eight principals and 13 classroom teachers.

c. Vocational High School Level

Principals, project personnel and classroom teachers, asked how children were selected, agreed that selection was based primarily on standardized test scores, the criterion mentioned by 11 of the 13 project personnel, 17 of the 28 classroom teachers, and by both of two responding principals. Other criteria taken into consideration were teacher recommendations and recommendations by the guidance counselors.

6. Materials and Supplies

a. Elementary School Level

The types of supplies and materials received by the school for the project were agreed upon by principals and personnel, but personnel more often reported these materials available. (See Table VI-6.)

The materials most frequently mentioned by both groups as having been provided for the project were remedial reading kits (S.R.A., Project READ), with books the second most frequently mentioned material. Even though books and remedial reading kits were listed as frequently received they were also the materials listed most often as "needed" by 54 percent of project personnel and 22 percent of principals. Audiovisual materials, mentioned as available by no principal or project personnel, were also occasionally mentioned as strongly needed (10 percent of the principals, 14 percent of the project personnel).

Project teachers were asked to comment on five characteristics of the materials provided for the project on a four-point scale ranging from "very good" to "poor." Characteristics on which they were asked to comment were "availability of the materials," "quantity of the materials" (sufficient for effective learning), "relevance to pupil background," "appropriateness for ability level," and "appropriateness for age level." Modal responses for criteria involving availability and quantity of materials were "very good." Modal responses for criteria involving quality of the materials was slightly less positive, however, with those for appropriateness for ability level, and for age level "good" and that for relevance to pupil's background "fair."

TABLE VI-6

MATERIALS PROVIDED FOR THE PROJECT ACCORDING TO PRINCIPALS AND PROJECT TEACHERS BY SCHOOL LEVEL

Level	Staff	Number of Respondents Listing Material					Total N
		Remedial Reading Kits	Books	Machines	Audiovisual Materials	Others	
Elementary	Principals	5	2	0	0	3	10
	Project Teachers	14	13	0	0	3	30
Junior high school	Principals	0	1	0	1	0	2
	Project Teachers	10	9	3	1	1	24
Vocational high school	Principals	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Project Teachers	7	4	2	0	0	13

b. Junior High School Level

Of 15 responding principals only two stated that they had received materials as contrasted with 24 of the 31 project personnel. As at the elementary level, the materials mentioned by project personnel as most frequently provided were remedial reading kits and books, with audiovisual materials and additional reading materials and books still needed.

Although at the junior high school level, the ratings of the materials yielded five modal responses of "very good," two criteria were still relatively weak: "relevance to pupil background" and "appropriateness for age level." In the latter category, although 11 responses fell into the "very good" category, ten fell into the "poor" category, almost a bimodal distribution.

c. Vocational High School Level

More project personnel reported they received additional materials and supplies for the program than did principals: seven of 13 project personnel but only one of five principals. Remedial reading kits (S.R.A., Project READ) were received by all of the seven project personnel, additional books were reported by four of them, and machines by two.

B. DYNAMICS OF THE PROGRAM

Three aspects of the dynamics of the program were reviewed: the first dealing with the project class itself (kinds of children involved, class size, length and frequency of classes, and teaching methods used); the second dealing with the relationship between the regular and remedial classes and teaching; and the third dealing with parental involvement.

1. Elementary School Level

Of the 70 regular elementary school teachers interviewed, 67 (96 percent) reported that children from their class attended remedial classes. A total of 1319 children were reported as having attended classes in corrective reading, 29 in guidance, and 37 in remedial mathematics. These children attended classes between one and four times a week, with mean of 2.7 times per week for remedial reading, 1.9 times per week for guidance, and 2.1 times per week in remedial math. These figures were slightly lower than the figures of the project personnel's estimate of the number of times per week children attended remedial classes, which had a mean of three times per week.

The project proposal called for small classes (between eight and ten children per class). According to the project personnel, class size of the remedial classes did for the most part (86 percent) adhere to these guidelines. Of 39 project personnel responses, two (15 percent) stated that classes had between one and five students, 28 (71 percent) said between six and ten students, five (13 percent) said between 11 and 15 students, one (3 percent) said between 16 and 20 students, one (2 percent) stated between 21 and 25 students and two (6 percent) indicated more than 25 students.

The length of the instructional period varied from 30 to 60 minutes, with modal lengths of time being 45 minutes and 60 minutes (each comprising 13 (34 percent) of the responses of the project personnel).

In terms of the relationship between project teachers and regular classroom teachers, the responses indicated that the frequency of their meeting ranged from once a week to once a month, with the project teacher (58 percent) and regular teacher (43 percent) stating that they met at least once a week. There were no project personnel who reported never meeting with the classroom teachers, while 6 percent of the classroom teachers reported that the project personnel never met with them.

The topic most often discussed during these meetings, according to both project personnel and classroom teachers, was pupil progress, mentioned by 55 (79 percent) of the classroom teachers and by 38 (90 percent) of the project teachers. Surprisingly, "identification of pupils," the topic second most frequently discussed according to the project personnel (62 percent), was discussed least frequently according to classroom teachers (39 percent). Also mentioned frequently by project personnel and infrequently by classroom teachers were "selection of materials," "ways to relate remedial instruction to school work," and "suggestions to help pupils not receiving remedial instruction." The discrepancy in response for the latter two topics, however, is due to the fact that while they were listed as distinct categories in the structured interview of the project personnel, they were not so listed for the structured interview of the regular classroom teacher. "Other" topics were listed as discussed by 11 (16 percent) of the regular teachers and by seven (17 percent) of the project personnel. The most commonly listed of the miscellaneous topics for regular teachers was the child's attitude.

The consistency between work done in the project classes and the regular classes was ascertained by asking both project personnel and regular teachers to rate this dimension on a four-point scale, ranging from "highly consistent" to "not consistent." The average response for both groups was between "consistent" (point 2) and "somewhat consistent" (point 3). The modal response for both groups was "consistent" (point 2). Thus, ten (28 percent) of the project personnel and ten (16 percent) of the teachers said the work was "highly consistent," 11 (30 percent) of the project personnel and 26 (41 percent) of the teachers felt that the work was "somewhat consistent," and five (14 percent of the project personnel and 12 (18 percent) of the classroom teachers felt that the work was "not consistent."

The project proposal stipulated that when children at any level were to be assisted in reading, workshops for their parents were to be conducted by each school district.

Twenty-six of the 28 responding school principals felt that the parents in the community were aware of the implementation of this project in the schools. However, only 28 principals responded out of the total of 41 interviewed and these indicated they had been informed primarily through parent-teacher meetings (19 of the 26 responses or 73 percent).

Project personnel admitted to not having come close to meeting with all of the parents of the children in their program. The modal response was having met with "some" of the parents: 18 (46 percent). Similarly, the frequency of their contact with parents was minimal, usually being once per year as indicated by 14 (50 percent) of the 28 responding project personnel. Other responses were: twice a year (9 percent), three or four times a year (7 percent), more than four times a year (11 percent).

Classroom teachers' modal estimates (24 percent) of numbers of parents aware of the project were "less than half." Eighteen (31 percent) of these teachers felt that all the parents were aware, nine (15 percent) felt that one-half of the parents were aware of the project, and seven (12 percent) felt that none of the parents were aware of the project.

Parental reaction to the project was overwhelmingly favorable according to every one of the 23 responding principals and to 45 (87 percent) of the 52 responding classroom teachers.[2] Of the remaining seven of the classroom teachers, five felt that it was too early to ascertain parental response (which is understandable if parents had been seen only once) and two said the parents were indifferent.

2. Junior High School

The percentage of junior high school classroom teachers reporting that children in their classes attended the supplementary classes funded by this project was lower than the percentage of elementary school classroom teachers so reporting. Twenty-five (78 percent) of the 32 junior high school regular classroom teachers reported children in their classes attending remedial classes, as compared with 96 percent of the regular teachers in elementary schools. On the junior high school level, a total of 686 children were reported as having attended these classes; 519 in reading, 83 in guidance, 83 in shop, and one in English for non-English speaking students. The modal response of the project personnel as to numbers of children who had previously attended remedial classes was "more than half." Frequency of classes ranged from one to ten times per week for corrective reading, with a mean of 3.95 times per week. Children attending guidance classes attended one time per week, children attending shop classes attended four times per week, and children attending English for non-English speaking students classes attended one time per week. These results were fairly consistent with those of the project personnel who reported working with their groups either two, three, or five times per week (a tri-modal curve).

---

[2] Of course, these are indirect estimates of parental response. Had a project been clearly identified and visible a direct evaluation of parental response would have been in order.

Class size for remedial classes on the junior high school level, as for those on the elementary school level, was small with the greatest number of project personnel reporting between six and ten children to each class. This class size was reported by 12 (40 percent) of the project personnel; eight (25 percent) of the personnel reported 11 to 15 students per class, one (2 percent) reported 16 to 20 students per class, five (16 percent) reported 21 to 25 students per class, and five (17 percent) reported classes with more than 25 students.

Variation in length of instructional periods was smaller for classes on the junior high school level than for those on the elementary school level. Here, class length varied from 39 to 47 minutes, with the majority of personnel listing 45 minutes as the most frequent duration of the class (although a considerable number of personnel did say that classes lasted 40 minutes). Thus, the 45-minute class was mentioned as most frequent by 19 (61 percent) of the project personnel and the 40-minute class was mentioned by eight (26 percent) of the project personnel.

Thirty of the 31 responding project personnel stated that they employed different teaching methods in this project than they would if they were teaching a regular class.

The difference most frequently mentioned between the methods used in this program and those which would be used in a regular class was a greater individualization of instruction (obviously possible with the small class sizes). This was mentioned by 21 (70 percent) of the responding project personnel. Also mentioned, each by approximately 20 percent of the project personnel, were a greater variety of materials and more time spent on specific skills or concepts. The one teacher who did not use different methods than he would have in a normal class did not do so because of his lack of familiarity with other teaching techniques.

Only ten of the 31 responding project teachers were given curriculum guides to follow. Six of these ten evaluated the guide, one classifying it as "better than average," two as "average," two

γ

as "below average," and one as "extremely poor."

In terms of meetings between the project personnel and the regular classroom teachers, each group reported meeting with the other with approximately equal frequency. Frequency of meeting ranged from twice a week to never. Thus, two (7 percent) of the 28 responding project personnel reported meeting with regular classroom teachers once or twice per week, six (21 percent) of the project personnel reported meeting with classroom teachers once a week, eight (29 percent) reported meetings once per month, and five (18 percent) reported never having met with classroom teachers. Seven (25 percent) reported meeting with classroom teachers at "other frequencies." Similarly, six (26 percent) of the classroom teachers reported meeting with the project personnel at least once a week. Four (17 percent) reported meetings every two or three weeks, three (13 percent) every month, and five (22 percent) reported never having met with project personnel. Five (22 percent) reported having met with project personnel at "other frequencies," in most cases on an "informal basis." The most frequent topic of discussion mentioned by both groups was pupil progress, mentioned by 18 (47 percent) of the responding project personnel and by 16 (50 percent) of the responding classroom teachers. Identification of pupils was the topic second most frequently listed by both groups, 12 (32 percent) of the responding project personnel and seven (22 percent) of the classroom teachers. Other topics mentioned as discussed in these meetings were "selection of materials for pupils in class," suggestions to help pupils not receiving remedial instruction, ways to relate remedial instruction to class work, and the child's attitude.

It would seem from responses from both of these groups, that work done in remedial classes related very well in about half of the cases to work done in regular classes, while in the other half of the cases, there was little relation at all. Responses were slightly more negative, however, for the classroom teachers. For the project personnel, there was actually a bimodal response, with nine (33 percent) of the 27 responding personnel rating the relationship between work done in these two classes as "highly consistent," and nine (33 percent) rating the relationship as "not consistent." Comparatively few responses appeared in the intermediary categories of "consistent" and "somewhat consistent." In the cases of the responses of the classroom teachers, although the greatest number of responses fell into the "not consistent" category (nine or 45 percent of the 20 responses), a large number fell also into the "consistent" category (seven or 35 percent). Relatively few responses fell into the "highly consistent" or the "somewhat consistent" categories.

As in the case of the elementary schools, the project proposal stipulated that when children at any level were to be assisted in reading, workshops for their parents were to be conducted by each school district.

Twelve of the 15 responding principals felt that the parents in the community were aware of the implementation of this project in the schools. As in the case of the elementary schools, principals responded that the parents were made aware of the program primarily through parent and teacher meetings. This was the response for five (45 percent) of the 11 principals who stipulated the manner in which the parents were informed of the project. Also mentioned were newsletters from the schools (by four or 36 percent of the principals) and "informed by their children" (mentioned by two or 19 percent of the principals).

Since the primary means by which parents were informed of the program was, according to the principals, through parent-teacher conferences, it might be worthwhile to examine the numbers of parents seen by project personnel. As in the case for elementary school project personnel, the project personnel on the junior high school level met with only a very small percentage of the parents. Thus, on a continuum of number of parents involved including five categories, "all," "most," "some," "few," and "none" of the parents, responses fell primarily into the "some," "few," and "none" categories, with the greatest number of responses in the "few" category. Of the 31 responding principals, three (10 percent) responded that they had met with "all the parents," three (10 percent) responded that they had met with "most of the parents," eight (26 percent) responded that they had met with "some of the parents," nine (29 percent) responded that they had met with "few" of the parents, and eight (25 percent) responded that they had met with no parents at all.

Of those personnel who did meet with parents, meetings were held mainly only once or twice during the year, with the maximum frequency of meetings having been five times per year. Of the 23 personnel who did meet with parents during the year, 22 stipulated the frequency of these meetings. Eight (36 percent) of these personnel met with parents only once during the year, eight (36 percent) met only twice with the parents, three (14 percent) met three or four times with the parents, and three (14 percent) met with them four or five times. When the regular classroom teachers were asked what percentage of the parents were aware of the project only 17 (53 percent) of the 32 regular teachers responded. Six of these 17 teachers responded that "all" the parents were aware of the program, five that more than half of the parents were aware of the project, three that "less than half" of the parents were aware of the project, and three that "none" of the parents were aware of the project.

For the most part, parents' attitudes toward the program were estimated to be favorable by the principals and by the regular teachers. It is interesting to note that only 12 of the regular teachers were able to comment on the attitude of the parents toward the program. Eleven of these 12 teachers rated parents' attitudes as favorable, and one rated parental attitudes as being indifferent. Eleven of the principals were able to comment on parents' attitudes toward the program. Nine of these principals felt that parental attitudes were favorable while two rated them as indifferent.

3. Vocational High School Level

Of the 21 classroom teachers interviewed, 14 reported that children from their classes attended remedial classes. A total of 281 children were said to be attending these classes, with the greatest number of them in the corrective reading groups. Thus, 116 (41 percent) of the children involved were in the reading groups, 20 (7 percent) in the guidance groups, 77 (27 percent) in the remedial math groups, ten (4 percent) in the groups for services to the deprived, 55 (20 percent) in shop groups, and three (1 percent) in Spanish groups. Considering the emphasis on guidance for this age level in the project proposal, surprisingly few of these children were reported to be receiving help in guidance. Project personnel were asked to estimate how many children in their group had previously received remedial instruction. Seven personnel responded to this question, two of whom answered that this was true of "all the children" in their group, one answering that it was true of "more than half" of these children, one answering that it was true of "less than half" of them, and three answering that it was true of "one or two" of them.

According to the classroom teachers, the average number of times per week that these classes met ranged from two times per week to five times per week. Those classes reported to have met most frequently by the classroom teachers were the shop classes and the classes for services to the deprived, each meeting an average of five times per week. Corrective reading classes were said to meet an average of four times per week, remedial math classes four times per week, Spanish classes three times per week, and guidance groups two times per week. Frequency of class meetings were estimated as slightly higher by the project personnel. Nine of the 13 project personnel responded as to the frequency of their class meetings, with all nine claiming to have conducted classes five times per week.

The length of each instructional class according to the project personnel ranged from 40 to 60 minutes, with the modal response being 45 minutes. Thus, of the nine responding personnel, two responded that classes lasted 40 minutes, five that they lasted 45 minutes, one that they lasted 50 minutes, and one that they lasted for 60 minutes.

Classes were generally larger in the high schools than they were for the junior high school and the elementary school levels, the modal response appearing in the 11 to 15 children per class category. Thus, of nine responding project personnel, one responded that his class size varied from six to ten students, five responded that their class size varied from 11 to 15 students, and three responded that their class size varied from 21 to 25 students.

Eight of the nine responding project personnel stated that they employed different teaching methods in this project than they would if they were teaching a regular class and again all of them said that the greatest difference was the greater individualization of instruction. In addition, six of the personnel responded that they were able to spend more time on specific skills or concepts, and two of the eight said they were able to use a greater variety of materials.

Only ten of the 21 project personnel responded as to whether they were given a curriculum guide to follow. Two of the ten answered affirmatively, one rating the guide as "better than average," and one rating the guide as "below average."

Project personnel reported more frequent meetings between themselves and regular classroom teachers than did the regular teachers. Thus, of ten project personnel responding, six (60 percent) reported meetings between themselves and the regular classroom teachers at least once per week. Only two (20 percent) reported never meeting with regular classroom teachers and two reported meetings at sporadic intervals. However, only three (25 percent) of the 12 responding classroom teachers reported meeting with project personnel as frequently as once per week, with four (33 percent) reporting never having met with project personnel. Five (52 percent) of the classroom teachers reported meeting with the project personnel on a sporadic basis, usually "informally."

The topic most frequently discussed by both groups was "pupil progress," having been mentioned by six (46 percent) of the project personnel and by eight (38 percent) of the regular classroom teachers. Other discussion topics mentioned frequently by the regular classroom teachers were "selection of materials," "identification of pupils," "child's attitude," and "discipline problems." Additional topics mentioned as discussed by the project personnel were, in order of frequency, "selection of materials for pupils in class," "ways to relate remedial instruction to class work," "identification of pupils," and "suggestions to help pupils not receiving remedial instruction."

The rate of response to the question asking for the consistency between remedial work and work done in the regular classroom was quite low. Thus, only nine of 21 regular teachers and seven of the 13 project personnel responded to this question. Of those who responded, however, project personnel seemed to feel that consistency was stronger than did the classroom teachers. Thus, of the seven project personnel, two felt that the relationship of work done between regular and remedial classes was "highly consistent," two felt it was "consistent," two felt that it was "somewhat consistent," and one felt that it was "not consistent." Of the nine regular classroom teachers, however, only one felt that the work was "highly consistent," one felt that the work was "consistent," three felt that the work was "somewhat consistent," and four felt that the work was "not consistent."

Five of the seven principals responded as to whether or not the parents were aware of this project. Of these five respondents, four said that parents were aware of the project. Two of these four said that parents were made aware of the project through newsletters from the school, one said they were made aware through parent-teacher meetings, and one said they were made aware by their children. A smaller percentage of classroom teachers, however, felt that parents were aware of the project. Twelve of the 21 classroom teachers responded to the question. Five (42 percent) of the 12 felt that all of the parents were aware of the project. One of the teachers felt that "more than half" of the parents were aware of the project, five (42 percent) that "less than half" of the parents were aware of the project, and one (8 percent) felt that "none" of the parents were aware of the project.

From responses of the project personnel, however, it is clear that less than half of the parents met with the project personnel, and that even if meetings did take place, these were not frequently scheduled conferences to inform parents of children's progress. Thus, of the ten responding project personnel, none said that they had met with all of the parents, two (20 percent) said they had met with "most of the parents," three (30 percent) said they had met with "some" of the parents, one (10 percent) said he had met with a "few" of the parents, and four (40 percent), said they had met with none of the parents. None of the personnel who claimed to have met with parents held these meetings more frequently than once during the year. The four responding principals reported parents' attitudes toward the project to be favorable, as did 13 of the 14 responding classroom teachers, the remaining teacher classifying parental reaction as "indifferent."

C. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

The reader is cautioned that the frame of reference of the respondents was the remedial program in their school. As noted earlier, in some instances this was a long established program, in others relatively new, but only rarely was it identified specifically with the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement," under evaluation here. Therefore the term "project" used in this discussion is basically synonymous with "remedial program in the school."

1. Elementary School Level

Project teachers, regular classroom teachers and principals were in agreement that the project has been helpful to the scholastic achievement of the students, with the project teacher and the classroom teachers feeling more strongly than the principals that the project has had a marked effect. Thus, when project personnel and classroom teachers were asked how much change they would expect to see in the pupils in their group this year, 21 (57 percent) of the 37 responding project teachers and 32 (51 percent) of the 63 responding classroom teachers answered "marked progress." Sixteen (43 percent) of the project teachers and 31 (49 percent) of the regular classroom teachers expected "slight progress." The principal's attitude toward the academic success of the project, although still favorable, was a little less so. Of the 26 responding principals, six (23 percent) felt that the effect of the project was "clearly noticeable," 11 (42 percent) "noticeable," three (12 percent) "slightly noticeable," and six (23 percent) "too early to tell."

Where project personnel were asked how, in their opinion, the project had been helpful to the academic improvement of the children, the answer most frequently given by 24 (65 percent) of the responding project personnel was "progress in reading and language arts." Second most frequently mentioned by 12 (33 percent) was "more positive attitudes toward school" (children were more interested and self-confident).

All three categories of people interviewed, principals, project teachers, and regular classroom teachers, also believed they saw positive attitudinal effects from the program. Here too, the principals seemed more reticent in their praise than did the project personnel and the classroom teachers. Thus, when the regular classroom teachers were asked what proportion of the children in the project they thought had favorable attitudes toward the supplementary classes, most of the 66 responding classroom teachers (70 percent) answered "all" with all but one of the others answering "most." Similarly, when project personnel were asked whether the project had been advantageous to the children in any way other than academically, almost all (94 percent) of the 34 responding project personnel answered "yes." The most frequently noted improvement (56 percent) was in the child's more positive self-image (confidence, success, self-esteem, self-expression, identity), better social adjustments (41 percent) and the child's heightened interest in his work (41 percent). However, when principals were asked the extent to which the experimental personnel had caused a change in student attitude, only four (16 percent) said they had seen a "clearly noticeable" effect, with another (58 percent) reporting a belief that there had been a "noticeable" effect. The others felt they had seen a "slightly noticeable" effect (4 percent), "no effect" (11 percent), or it was "too early to tell" (11 percent).

Attitudes of project personnel and regular classroom teachers expressed about their own roles were consistently favorable toward the program. Thus all 42 project personnel said they felt that as teachers, they were able to handle the educational needs of project children because of their personal interest in understanding the pupils (mentioned by 20 or 47 percent of the 42 project personnel) and their experience in working with children from poverty areas.

When regular classroom teachers were asked about the project, most (59 or 84 percent) felt that it was effective, while only two (3 percent) felt that it was not effective. Three (4 percent) felt that it was too early to tell and six (9 percent) felt that the program was too limited in terms of children selected and the number of teachers.

When principals were asked whether they felt that the assignment of personnel to the project had affected teacher morale, 21 of 28 respondents said that morale had been affected (18 positively and three negatively). The most frequently cited reason for positive responses was that providing remedial professional personnel enabled the regular teachers to function more effectively. Reasons for morale being affected negatively were 1. resentment on the part of the classroom teacher of the project teacher, who is able to be involved with smaller groups, and 2. schedule conflicts between regular and project teachers.

Principals, project and regular classroom teachers were asked to list the strengths and weaknesses of the project. All three groups generally agreed that the primary strengths of the program were the greater individualization of instruction and the remedial help it provided in specific subject areas. Although all three categories of personnel agreed on weaknesses of the program, priorities given for each weakness varied. Regular teacher and project personnel said that the fundamental weakness of the project was the limited amount of time spent in remedial instruction. The major weakness according to the principals was lack of adequate supplies and materials.

Recommendations to improve the project therefore centered upon additional teachers or full-time project personnel (suggested strongly by all three groups), additional supplies and materials (suggested most strongly by principal and project personnel), smaller classes (suggested most by project personnel) and increased scope of the project (suggested most by the regular classroom teacher).

2. Junior High School Level

Project teachers, regular teachers, and principals were in agreement that the project had been helpful to the academic achievement of the students, with the project personnel and the teachers claiming a slightly greater improvement than did the principals. Thus, when project personnel were asked how much change they would expect to see in the pupils in their group this year, 18 (60 percent) of the responding personnel answered "marked progress," while the remaining 12 (40 percent) answered "slight progress." Similarly, when teachers were asked to comment on the academic improvement of their students, 11 (52 percent) of the 21 responding teachers reported "marked improvement," nine (43 percent) reported "slight improvement," and only one reported no improvement at all. The principals' attitudes toward the academic success of the program, although still favorable, was a little less so. Thus, of 16 responding principals only one felt that student progress was "clearly noticeable" due to the project, while eight (50 percent) felt that student progress was "noticeable." Seven (44 percent) felt that it was too early to evaluate student progress. Principals claimed to have based their estimates primarily on teachers' reports, although standard test scores did play a large role in the estimates. Thus, of the 16 responding principals, eight (50 percent) claimed to have based their estimates on "teachers' reports" while five (31 percent) based their estimates on Standard Test Scores. In addition, one principal based his estimate on "parents' reports" and two based theirs on "subjective feelings."

When project personnel were asked to specify in what ways the project had been helpful to the academic improvement of the children, the greatest number of responses were first, that the program was helpful in contributing to student progress in reading and the language arts and second, that the program facilitated more positive attitudes toward school. Each of these responses was mentioned by nine (32 percent) of the responding personnel.

All three groups of personnel interviewed agreed that the program had been helpful in fostering more favorable attitudes toward school. Thus, when project personnel were asked whether the project has been advantageous to the children in any ways other than academically, 29 out of 30 responding answered "yes." Of the 30, 16 (53 percent) answered that the child had a more positive self-image (confidence, success, pride, self-esteem, self-expression, and identity) and seven (23 percent) of the responding personnel answered that the child had made improved social adjustments as a result of this project. Also mentioned, although less frequently, were that the child was more interested in his work, the students became more aware of and concerned about long-range goals, including future employment and education, and that there was better rapport established between the students and their teachers.

Similarly when teachers were asked what percentage of project children in their class had expressed favorable attitudes toward their supplementary classes, most of the teachers responded that "most" or "all" of the children have expressed such attitudes. Thus, of 20 responding teachers, eight (40 percent) answered that all the children had expressed such attitudes and nine (45 percent) that most of the children had expressed favorable attitudes. Only one of the teachers answered that few of the children had expressed favorable attitudes, and only two of the teachers answered that none of the children had expressed such attitudes. Estimates of seven of 16 responding principals were that the project had "noticeable effect" on student attitudes. Five of the remaining nine principals responded that the effect was "clearly noticeable," one responded that the effect was "slightly noticeable," and three felt that it was too early to tell whether or not there had been a change in student attitudes as a result of the project.

Attitudes of the regular classroom teachers were generally favorable toward this project. Thus, 30 of the 32 responding teachers felt that the program was effective. Only two felt that the program was not effective. Three of the teachers, however, did feel that the program was too limited in terms of the numbers of teachers and students involved.

When principals were asked whether they felt that the assignment of personnel to this project had affected teacher morale, 14 of the responding principals answered "yes" while two answered "no." Twelve of the 14 principals who felt that teacher morale was affected felt that it was affected positively, while two felt that it was affected negatively. The reason most frequently given for positive changes in morale was that by providing remedial professional personnel the regular teachers were able to function more effectively. Reasons presented for a negative change in teacher morale were fear of change and the resentment of the classroom teachers toward project personnel who were able to work under more ideal conditions.

Project personnel were generally satisfied with their ability to handle the educational needs of the children in their classes. Of the 26 project personnel answering this question 25 answered that they felt capable of handling the needs of students in their classes, while one did not. Personnel felt their capability stemmed primarily from the experience with working with children from poverty areas and from their personal interest in and understanding of the pupils.

Strengths of the program most frequently mentioned by the three groups interviewed were that 1. it provided remedial help in specific subject areas, 2. that it improved student's interest and attitude, and 3. that it provided greater individualization of instruction. All of these strengths were mentioned most frequently by the regular classroom teachers. The first was mentioned by nine (40 percent) of the responding principals, by 15 (47 percent) of the regular teachers, and by 16 (38 percent) of the project personnel. The second strength was mentioned by ten (31 percent) of the classroom teachers, six (26 percent) of the principals, and by ten (26 percent) of the project personnel. The third strength also was mentioned by 15 (47 percent) of the regular teachers, by 12 (32 percent) of the project personnel, and by five (22 percent) of the principals. Another strength mentioned frequently by regular teachers and by project personnel were the additional materials. A fair percentage of the project personnel also mentioned the provision for new techniques in teaching.

While the three groups of personnel interviewed agreed as to the basic strengths of the program, they were not in agreement on the major weaknesses of the program. Weaknesses most often mentioned by the regular teachers were the lack of proper coordination of the project (mentioned by eight, 25 percent), the limited amount of time spent in remedial teaching (mentioned by seven, 22 percent), and conflicts between themselves and the project teachers (mentioned by seven, 22 percent). The major weakness listed by project personnel was the lack of adequate supplies and materials, mentioned by ten (30 percent). Other major weaknesses mentioned by this group were the limited amount of time spent in teaching and the large size of the remedial classes hampering effective individual instruction. Both of these factors were mentioned by five (14 percent) of the project personnel. Lack of adequate supplies and materials was also the major weakness mentioned by principals, having been mentioned by five (18 percent) of the responding principals. The second most frequently mentioned weakness was the lack of adequate personnel, mentioned by four (14 percent) of the personnel. Specific materials needed were discussed in detail above. Suggestions to improve the program, therefore, involved first, additional supplies and materials and second, additional personnel.

Further suggestions for the improvement of the program were that personnel (principals, teachers, and project teachers) be better informed about the project, that these personnel (especially principals and classroom teachers) help in the planning of the program, that better schedules be set up to accommodate both Corrective Reading Teachers and regular classroom teachers, that remedial classes be even smaller than they are now, and that more space be provided for the program.

3. Vocational High School Level

Project personnel, regular classroom teachers, and principals were in agreement that the project has been helpful to the academic achievement of the students. Thus, of the ten responding classroom teachers, eight claimed to have seen "marked progress" in the project students and two to have noticed "slight progress." Similarly, all ten of the responding project personnel felt that the project had been helpful to the academic improvement of the children. Five would expect to see "marked progress" this year, while four expected to see "slight progress." All of the project personnel felt that students had shown progress in reading and language arts. In addition, five of them felt that the project had facilitated more positive attitudes toward school, and four that students had shown improvement in standardized test scores.

Three of the five responding principals said that the project personnel had produced a "noticeable" effect on improving student performance, while two felt that it was too early to tell. Two of the principals claimed to have based their estimates on standard test scores, two on teachers' reports, and one said that his estimate was purely subjective.

Not only were school personnel agreed that the program had an academic effect upon the students, but they agreed that the program had an effect upon the students' attitudes toward himself and toward school. Five principals responded as to the extent the additional personnel have exercised a change in student attitudes. One of these five answered that the effect was "clearly noticeable," three answered that the effect was "noticeable," and one answered that it was "too early to tell." Similarly, when the regular classroom teachers were asked what percentage of the project children in their classes have expressed favorable attitudes toward the project, four of the 11 responding teachers answered that "all" of the project students in their classes had expressed such attitudes, while seven answered that this was true of "most" of the project children in their class. Finally, of ten responding project personnel, nine felt that the project had been advantageous to the children in ways other than academically; five felt that the children developed a more positive self-image as a result of the program; four that children had made better social adjustments as a result of the project, or were more interested in their work than they were previous to the project; three felt that better rapport had developed between the teacher and the student; and one that the students were, subsequent to the program, more concerned with long range goals (education and employment) than they were previously.

In terms of attitudes of school personnel toward the program, project personnel seemed to feel very positive about their role in the program, and classroom teachers to feel that the project was very effective. Principals were divided as to their perceptions of how the program had affected teacher morale.

All of the project personnel felt that as teachers they were able to handle the educational needs of their students. The primary reason for this success (mentioned by nine) was the teacher's interest in and understanding of the students. In addition, five of the project personnel attributed their success to their experience in working with children from poverty areas. Similarly, all of the regular classroom teachers interviewed felt that the program was "effective." Four of these teachers, however, felt that the program was too limited in terms of the children involved and the numbers of teachers. Three of the five responding principals felt that the program had an effect upon teacher morale and of the three, two felt that the effect was positive, because by providing remedial professional personnel, the regular teachers were able to function more effectively. The principal who felt that the program had a negative effect upon teacher morale did not specify his reason.

All three groups of personnel interviewed felt that the greatest strength of the program was the "greater individualization of instruction." This was mentioned by three of the principals, 11 of the project personnel, and by 17 of the regular teachers. Also mentioned as strengths of the program were the students' improved attitudes and interest, the program's provision of remedial help in specific subject areas, and the opportunity for early diagnosis of student problems. Strengths mentioned by regular teachers, in order of frequency, were the presence of experienced personnel to train inexperienced personnel, the availability of new materials, and the provision for new teaching techniques.

Project personnel and regular classroom teachers both agreed that the major weakness of the program was the lack of structure and coordination. Principals felt that the major weakness of the program was the lack of adequate materials and supplies. Shortage of experienced teachers was mentioned second most frequently by project personnel and by principals, with regular classroom teachers mentioning that remedial classes were not small enough to provide for individualization of instruction.

The major recommendation made by the regular teachers was additional supplies and materials. The major recommendation of the principals was specialized training for teachers and paraprofessionals, whereas project personnel noted a need for more structure and organization for the program. Additional supplies and materials were also recommended by the principals and project personnel. Other recommendations made by project personnel, all made with equal frequency, were additional teachers, special training for teachers and paraprofessionals, and better ways of selecting children to be in the program. Other suggestions made by regular teachers, in order of frequency, were beginning the concentration of the program before the third grade, informing the principals, the teachers, and the project teachers about the project (a recommendation strongly needed as might be seen from the data presented above), more structure for the program, and smaller classes.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

From the preceding data one cannot help but note a striking contrast between the haphazard manner in which the program seems to have been implemented and its very positive evaluation.

If one compares the findings with the project proposal, one must admit that it is questionable that the program was ever implemented. According to the principals, over half of the schools that were supposed to have received new project personnel did not actually receive them (61 percent, 59 percent, 71 percent).[1] The numbers of personnel actually received were far greater at the elementary and far smaller at the vocational high school levels than the numbers provided for by the project. More than one out of five of the responding project personnel listed by the Board of Education (30 percent, 23 percent, 31 percent) claimed to have been fully participating in the program for a longer period of time than the program's existence. It was clear that at least one out of three (38 percent, 34 percent, 50 percent) project personnel listed by the Board of Education were unaware of the project's existence. This can be seen either by their direct statement to this effect or by their claim that they had been informed of the project long before its inception. Many principals (34 percent, 50 percent, 14 percent) were never informed of their school's participation in the program. Most principals (77 percent, 68 percent, 56 percent) had never seen a copy of the project proposal. According to school staff, parents were generally unaware of the program's existence. Little emphasis seemed to be placed on guidance for the junior high schools and vocational high schools.

Yet, evaluation of the program yielded highly favorable results concerning fulfillment of the program's goals as perceived by the school personnel. It was agreed by principals, project personnel, and classroom teachers that the program had a favorable effect upon the academic achievement of the students. Student attitudes, self images, and social adjustment, according to school personnel, seemed also to have been improved as a result of the program. Likewise, teacher morale was heightened. Strengths of the program were similar at all three levels whether listed by project personnel, principals, or classroom teachers.

One can only conclude from these paradoxical results, that

---

[1] When three figures are presented in parenthesis, the first refers to the Elementary level, the second to the Junior High School and the third to the Vocational High Schools.

answers given by personnel applied not to the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools" specifically, but rather to remedial classes in general. This project, if ever implemented, was so similar to remedial work done in the past, that it could not be distinguished as a separate or an original entity.

A POSTSCRIPT

It should be clear to the reader at this point why the "Introduction" to this report stated that the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools" never existed per se, other than on paper.

A remedial reading program was in fact functioning, and observers generally felt it was functioning well, even though the data on attendance and particularly, on the achievement scores, showed no concrete effects. Since remedial programs have existed for a long time and independently of this project, it would appear that the project was providing budgetary support for an already established cycle of remedial instruction. One could argue that without this budgetary support, under the guise of a "project," already existing programs would be sharply curtailed or terminated. If so, it would then seem appropriate to seek direct financial aid as such, rather than seek to create the illusion of providing new and increased services. The ramifications of such fictions may prove disastrous; they often lead to charges and innuendos about groups of children to the effect that these children are incapable of learning regardless of how many millions of dollars are poured into a school system or how many new remedial or experimental approaches are tried. Certainly, as in this case, the facts reveal that nothing new was being done and few new services were actually being offered.

APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF PUPILS ATTENDING SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROJECT, BY BOROUGH

Data about the ethnic background of the children attending project schools are presented in Tables A and B. The Tables present the number and percent of Negro, Puerto Rican, and "other" pupils enrolled in the schools which participated in the "Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools" for the school year 1968-69. Table A presents the data by borough and by level of school; Table B presents the distribution of students within each ethnic group attending project schools.

At the elementary school level, the majority of pupils in project schools in Manhattan, Bronx, Queens, and Brooklyn were Negro or Puerto Rican. Project schools in Queens (76 percent) and Brooklyn (52 percent) had a majority of Negro students, with Puerto Rican students constituting a majority (53 percent) in the Bronx. However, a majority of the students (74 percent) in Richmond were "other" ethnic status, that is, generally white.

Similarly, in project schools at the junior high school and vocational high school levels, there is a plurality of Negro or Puerto Rican students in most boroughs. At the junior high school level the majority of students in Brooklyn, Manhattan, and the Bronx were Negro and Puerto Ricans; whereas, the majority of students in Richmond (90 percent) and in Queens (72 percent) were "other" ethnic status. At the vocational high school level the majority of students were Negro or Puerto Rican in all boroughs. In Queens 83 percent of the students were Negro, and in the Bronx 52 percent were Puerto Rican.

Of the total Negro population, most attended Brooklyn schools at the elementary, junior high school, and vocational high school levels; whereas, most of the Puerto Rican population attended schools in the Bronx and Brooklyn at all three levels. The highest percent of the "other" population occurred in Brooklyn at the elementary and vocational high school levels and in Queens and Brooklyn at the junior high school level.

TABLE A

Percent of Negro, Puerto Rican, and Other Pupils by Boroughs on Register in Project Schools for School Year 1968-1969

Elementary School

Borough	Negro	Puerto Rican	Other[1]	Total	Number of Children
Manhattan	43	41	16	100	47,654
Bronx	40	53	7	100	69,895
Queens	76	4	20	100	11,890
Richmond	20	6	74	100	2,573
Brooklyn	52	35	13	100	94,973
					226,985

Junior High School

Borough	Negro	Puerto Rican	Other[1]	Total	Numberof Children
Manhattan	42	34	24	100	33,653
Bronx	33	38	29	100	46,784
Queens	25	3	72	100	49,912
Richmond	8	2	90	100	8,666
Brooklyn	37	21	42	100	82,907
					221,922

Vocational High School

Borough	Negro	Puerto Rican	Other[1]	Total	Number of Children
Manhattan	38	37	25	100	8,393
Bronx	34	52	14	100	6,271
Queens	83	10	7	100	1,066
Richmond	-	-	-	-	-
Brooklyn	40	32	28	100	11,620
					27,350

---

[1] Other includes Oriental, Spanish, American Indian and "others."

Table B

Percent of Negro, Puerto Rican, and Other Students Attending Project Schools Within Each Ethnic Group for the School Year 1968-1969

	Elementary Schools			
Borough	**Negro**	**Puerto Rican**	**Other[1]**	
Manhattan	19	21.4	27	
Bronx	26	41	18	
Queens	8.5	.5	8	
Richmond	.5	.1	6	
Brooklyn	46	37	41	
Total	100	100	100	
No. of Children	107,221	90,220	29,544	226,985

	Junior High Schools			
Borough	**Negro**	**Puerto Rican**	**Other[1]**	
Manhattan	19	24	7	
Bronx	21	36	14	
Queens	17	3	36	
Richmond	1	-	8	
Brooklyn	42	37	35	
Total	100	100	100	
No. of Children	73,265	48,297	100,360	221,922

	Vocational High Schools			
Borough	**Negro**	**Puerto Rican**	**Other[1]**	
Manhattan	29	31	33	
Bronx	20	32	14	
Queens	8	1	2	
Richmond	-	-	-	
Brooklyn	43	36	51	
Total	100	100	100	
No. of Children	10,876	10,226	6,248	27,350

[1] Other includes Oriental, Spanish, American Indian and "others."

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

	Page
Individual Lesson Observation Report	B1
Interview Guide for Project Instructional Personnel	B13
Teacher Interview Guide	B18
Principal's Interview Guide	B21

Center for Urban Education

Evaluation of the Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT

School____________________ Borough____________ Grade_____ Class________

Teacher's Name____________________ Sex_____ Observer________________

Length of Observation________________ Activities Observed________________

Date____________________

1. Content of lesson observed.

Subject Area	Content of lesson
1. Reading	
2. Guidance	
3. Math	
4. Science	
5. Shop	
6. English	
7. Other	

2. What was the length of this lesson?

3. Did you see the entire lesson?

   1. Yes
   2. No, I missed the beginning
   3. No, I missed the end

4. a) Approximate number of children in teaching unit____________

   b) Number of children absent____________

5. a) Is this group homogeneous according to:

	Yes	No
Age or Grade level		
Achievement level		

b) What was the grade or age level of the children observed? ____________________

c) Approximately, what was their achievement level?

6. a) Where pupils divided into more than one instruction group?

1. Yes **2. No**

b) If YES, please circle the number of groups and then fill in the number of pupils in that group.

Number of groups	**Number of pupils in each group**		
1. 2	**(A)**	**(B)**	
2. 3	**(A)**	**(B)**	**(C)**
3. 4 or more			

7. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this teaching unit?

1. Completely typical
2. Reasonable approximation
3. Atypical. Explain:

8. a) Did this lesson provide the opportunity for individualization of instruction?

1. **It provided considerable opportunity**
2. **It provided some opportunity**
3. **There was little or no opportunity**

b) Please explain your basis for this rating.

9. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for independent work?

1. **Considerable possibility for independent work**
2. **Some opportunity for independent work**
3. **Little or no opportunity for independent work**
8. **Not relevant. Explain**

10. Was this lesson related to the children's regular class work?

1. **Very close relationship**
2. **Some relationship**
3. **Little or no relationship**
4. **Can't tell.**

11. To what extent did this lesson refer to earlier material completed by this group?

1. **Considerable reference**
2. **Some reference**
3. **No reference**
8. **Not relevant. Explain:**

12. To what extent did this lesson provide an opportunity for continuity with future lessons?

   1. Considerable opportunity for continuity
   2. Some opportunity for continuity
   3. Little or no opportunity for continuity
   8. Not relevant. Explain:

13. What amount of planning was evident in this lesson?

   1. Exceptionally well-planned
   2. Well-planned
   3. Showed some evidence of planning
   4. Showed few or no signs of planning

14. What amount of organization was evident in this lesson?

   1. Exceptionally well organized
   2. Well organized
   3. Showed some evidence of organization
   4. Showed few or no signs of organization

15. Level of creativity and imagination evident in this class.

   1. Extremely creative
   2. Predominantly creative
   3. Equally creative and stereotyped
   4. More stereotyped than creative
   5. Extremely stereotyped

16. If you rated this lesson as "extremely" or "predominantly creative", please explain the basis for the rating.

17. a) Were the materials and/or devices used specifically related to the particular skill or ability in which the child is deficient?

1. Yes **2. No**

b) Explain the basis for your answer.

18. Was this lesson appropriate to the age level of the group?

1. **Consistent opportunity for the children to relate the lesson to their own age level.**
2. **Some opportunity for the children to relate the lesson to their own age level.**
3. **Lesson was remote from the children's age level.**

19. What teaching aids or audio-visual materials were used in this lesson?

20. How effectively were these teaching aids utilized?

1. **Used effectively**
2. **Used but not particularly effectively**
3. **Little or no use of teaching aids**
8. **Not relevant. Explain;**

21. How would you rate the teacher's adaptation of materials to the number of students in the group?

1. Excellent adaptation to unit size: at least some things done unique to unit size
2. Effective efforts made to utilize group size
3. Some effort made to adapt to unit size
4. Little or no effort made to adapt to unit size

22. How would you rate the amount of material covered to date, keeping in mind the fact that there has been a disruption of school because of the teachers' strike and the program has been in effect less than three months?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant. Explain:

23. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant. Explain:

24. How many children showed interest and enthusiasm?

1. Every or almost every child
2. More than half the children
3. Half the children
4. Fewer than half the children
5. Very few or no children
8. Not relevant. Explain:

25. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

1. Every or almost every child
2. More than half the children
3. About half the children
4. Fewer than half the children
5. Very few or no children
6. Teacher asked few or no questions, although material or lesson made questioning possible
7. Lesson did not lend itself to questions

26. How many children raised questions?

1. Every or almost every child
2. More than half the children
3. About half the children
4. Fewer than half the children
5. Very few or no children
6. A few children asked questions, although material or lesson made questioning possible.
7. Material did not lend itself to questioning

27. How would you describe the teacher's overall handling of the children's questions?

1. Questions were welcomed and built on
2. Questions were answered cursorily
3. Questions were ignored
4. Opportunity for questions was there but few or none were asked. Why?

5. Material did not lend itself to questions

28. What was the overall participation of the children?

1. Every or almost every child was actively involved
2. More than half participated
3. About half participated
4. Fewer than half participated
5. Very few or none participated
8. Not relevant. Explain:

29. What was the children's general understanding of the teacher's spoken word?

1. Every or almost every child understood fully
2. More than half understood
3. About half the children understood fully
4. Fewer than half the children understood
5. Very few or no children understood

30. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

1. Always or almost always spoke to the children on their level of understanding
2. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding more than half the time
3. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding about half the time
4. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding less than half the time
5. Seldom or never spoke to the children on their level of understanding

31. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with Non-English speaking children?

1. Communicates with ease
2. Communicates with some difficulty
3. Communicates with great difficulty
8. Not relevant. Explain:

32. **How would you describe the overall relationship among the children?**

1. **All or almost all the children seem to get along well with others as a total class**
2. **All or almost all the children seem to get along well with some of the others with evidence of some isolates**
3. **About half the children seem to get along well with others**
4. **Very few or no children seem to get along well with others**

33. **How would you describe the overall Teacher-Pupil relationship?**

1. **Teacher seems to get along well with all or almost all in the group**
2. **Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, ignoring the rest**
3. **Teacher seems to get along well with about half the pupils**
4. **Teacher seems to get along well with very few or none of the pupils**
5. **Teacher shows overt distaste for some pupils**

34. **How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?**

1. **Outstanding**
2. **Better than average**
3. **Average**
4. **Below average**
5. **Extremely poor**

35. **In what type of room was this lesson given ?**

36. **a) Was this room primarily set up for this instructional group?**

1. Yes **2. No**

b) Explain your rating

37. How would you rate the appearance of this room?

1. **Extremely attractive**
2. **Of greater than average attractiveness**
3. **Average**
4. **Less than average**
5. **Unattractive**

Additional observations:

38. How would you describe the class atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

1. **Undisciplined and warm**
2. **Undisciplined and cold**
3. **Disciplined yet congenial or warm**
4. **Disciplined and cold**
5. **Overdisciplined yet warm**
6. **Overdisciplined and cold**

39. Most of the children in this group seemed:

1. **Relaxed**
2. **Somewhat restrained**
3. **Inhibited**

40. Teacher evaluation of pupil progress was generally (circle all that apply)

1. **Omitted**
2. **Critical or negative**
3. **Not done in terms of criteria**
4. **Not supported by suggestions for improvement**
5. **Included**
6. **Encouraged or positive**
7. **Done in terms of criteria**
8. **Supported by suggestions for improvement**

41. The teacher's expectations seemed:

    1. High for pupils in this group
    2. Low for the pupils in this group
    3. Realistic for group
    4. The teacher did not indicate any expectations for the pupils

    Explain a rating of 1 or 2

42. The teacher made an attempt to praise:

    1. All or almost every pupil
    2. About half of the pupils
    3. Less than half the pupils
    4. None

43. Describe any incidents that occurred during the lesson that interfered with teaching and how the teacher handled these incidents

44. **In your opinion what effect will continued participation in this type of remedial group have on the academic achievement of these pupils? (Specify the proportions of the group that you would expect in each category)**

1. Marked progress	________%
2. Slight progress	________%
3. No change	________%
4. Slightly worse	________%
5. Appreciably worse	________%
TOTAL	**100%**

OBSERVER'S SIGNATURE ________________________________

Center for Urban Education

Evaluation of the Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PROJECT INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children." We would like to ask you a few questions relating to this project. Your answers will be held in absolute confidence. Only the project director and her research staff will ever see any of this material, and none of it will ever be attributed to a specific individual or tied to a school, directly or indirectly, in any of our reports.

Name____Date________________

School #_______________District #_____________Borough________________

1. Your position in the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children?"

   ____

2. License (s): (Please circle)

   1. Early Childhood
   2. Common Branches
   3. Junior High School - Subject______________________
   4. High School - Subject____________________________
   5. Other (specify)_________________________________

3. Total years of teaching experience______________________

4. Years at this school__________________________________

5. a) Did you receive specialized preparation in the area in which you are now assigned to this project?

   1. Yes 2. No

   b) If YES, please specify the type of training you received.

6. a) When were you informed about this project? ____________________

   b) When were you assigned to implement this project? ____________

   c) For how long have you been fully participating in this project? ____________________

7. Approximately how many children compose each group with whom you work?

   ____

8. How many times a week do you work with each group? ____________________

9. What is the length of an instructional period? ____________________

10. a) Have you received any new materials to implement your teaching?

    1. Yes   2. No

    b) If yes, what?

    c) If not, what are your needs?

11. Please rate the following five characteristics of the books, supplies and materials you have been given for use in your classes.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Availability (start with the first week)				
2. Quantity, i.e., sufficient for effective learning				
3. Relevance to pupil background				
4. Appropriateness for ability level				
5. Appropriateness for age level				

12. To what extent is there a consistent relationship between work done in your group and the classroom?

    1. Highly consistent relationship between project class work and regular class work.
    2. Consistent relationship between project class work and regular class work
    3. Somewhat consistent relationship between project classwork and regular class work.
    4. Not consistent relationship between project class work and regular class work

13. How many parents of the children in your group have you seen?

1. All
2. Most
3. Some
4. Few
5. None

14. How often have you had contact with the parents of the children in your group?

1. Never
2. Once
3. Twice
4. 3 or 4 times
5. More than 4 times

15. a) Do you employ different teaching methods in this project than you would if you were teaching a regular class?

1. Yes 2. No.

b) if YES, describe how your teaching methods differ.

c) If NO, why not?

16. a) Were you given a curriculum guide to follow:

1. Yes 2. No

b) If YES, how would you evaluate it's appropriateness?

17. How were the children in your groups selected?

18. To your knowledge what proportion of the children in your group have previously received remedial instruction?

1. All
2. More than half
3. Less than half
4. One or two
5. None

19.a) In your opinion, has this project been helpful to the academic improvement of the children?

1. Yes 2. No

b) if YES, in what ways?

c) If NO, why not?

20. a) Has this project been advantageous to the children in any ways other than academically?

1. Yes 2. No

b) If YES, please describe advantages.

c) If NO, why not?

21. a) How often do you consult or discuss pupil progress with the classroom teacher?

1. Once a week
2. Once to twice a week
3. Once a month
4. Never. Why?

5. Other ___________________

b) If you do consult with the classroom teacher, what do you usually discuss? Circle ALL that apply.

1. Selection of appropriate materials for pupils in class.
2. Identification of pupils
3. Pupil progress
4. Suggestions to help pupils not receiving remedial instruction
5. Ways to relate remedial instruction to class room work
6. Other ___________________

22. On the average, how much change would you expect to see in your pupils in this group this year?

1. Marked progress
2. Slight progress
3. No change
4. Slightly worse
5. Appreciably worse

23. Do you think that as a teacher you are able to handle the educational needs in your specific area of the children in the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children"?

    1. Yes

       Why?

    2. No

       Why?

24. In your opinion what are the specific strengths of the program?

25. In your opinion what are the specific weaknesses of the program?

26. What recommendations would you suggest to improve this program?

27. Additional comments:

Center for Urban Education

Evaluation of the Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children

TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children." We would like to ask you a few questions relating to this project. Your answers will be held in absolute confidence. Only the project director and her research staff will ever see any of this material, and none of it will ever be attributed to a specific individual or tied to a school, directly or indirectly, in any of our reports.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important phase of our study.

Name ______________________________ Date __________________

School ________________ District # ________ Borough ________

Class ____________________

1. Your total number of years of teaching experience ______________
2. Your total number of years of teaching expetience at this school? _____
3. Please specify the number of children who attend the supplementary classes funded by the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children?" in the areas listed below, and how many times a week they attend.

   a) I know of no children who attend such classes.

IF YOU CIRCLED "a" PLEASE DO NOT CONTINUE ANY FURTHER

   b) The number who attend are as follows:

Classes	Number of Children	Number of Times Per Week
1. Corrective Reading		
2. Guidance		
3. Remedial Math Instruction		
4. Services to the Deprived		
5. Shop		
6. Other (specify)		

4. How were the children in your class selected as participants in this project?

5. On what date did the children in your class begin to attend the project class(es)?

6. What proportions of the children involved in this project have expressed favorable attitudes toward the supplementary classes.

   1. All
   2. Most
   3. Few
   4. None

7. a) How often does the project teacher consult with or inform you about pupil progress?

   1. At least once a week
   2. Every two to three weeks
   3. Once a month
   4. Never
   5. Other____

   b) What do you usually discuss?

   1. Selection of materials
   2. Identification of pupils
   3. Pupil progress
   4. Other____

8. To what extent is there a consistent relationship between the work done in the project classes and your class?

   1. Highly consistent relationship between project class work and regular class work.
   2. Consistent relationship between project class work and regular class work.
   3. Somewhat consistent relationship between project class work and regular class work.
   4. Not consistant.

9. What are your feelings about this project?

10. a) How many parents of the children in your class are aware of this project?

    1. All
    2. More than half
    3. Less than half
    4. None

    b) If possible, please specify their attitudes toward this project.

11. On the average, how much change have you seen in the pupils in the project classes this year?

    1. Marked progress
    2. Slight
    3. No change
    4. Slightly worse
    5. Appreciably worse

12. In your opinion, what do you consider the specific strengths of this project?

13. In your opinion, what do you consider the specific weaknesses of this project?

14. What recommendations would you suggest to improve this project?

Center for Urban Education

Evaluation of the Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children

PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW GUIDE

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children." We would like to ask you a few questions relating to this program. Only the project director and her immediate staff will see any record of this questionnaire. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way with our reports.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

School____________________District #__________Borough__________

Grades: From________________to____________________________

Principal's Name__________________________Date________________

1. How long have you been principal at this school?

2. What is the present school population?____________________________

3. Have you ever seen or been sent a copy of the proposal for the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children?" (please circle)

a) 1. Yes, I have seen a copy of the project proposal.
   2. Please explain under what circumstances:

b) 1. Yes, I received a copy of the project proposal.
   2. By whom was it sent:

c) No.

4. a) Have you ever been officially informed that this school was designated as a participant in the "Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Children?"

1. Yes 2. No

b) If YES, on what date?____________________

c) How were you informed about this project?____________________

____

d) Were you asked to participate in the planning of this project?

1. Yes 2. No

5. The statements below describe possible personnel changes as a result of this project. For each of the two dates (9/68 and 2/69) place a check next to the statement which best describes the status of the project in your school as of that date.

	As of 9/68	As of 2/69
1. I received (________ number) additional personnel which I filled		
2. I received no additional personnel but persons already on staff were transferred to the project		
3. I have no knowledge of any personal changes as a result of this project		

6. Your school was to receive the following positions noted below. Please verify the accuracy of the listed number of positions assigned and received.

	As of 9/1968		As of 2/1969	
Position	# Assigned	# Received	#Assigned	#Received
1. Corrective Reading Teacher				
2. Guidance				
3. Remedial Math Instruction				
4. Services to the Deprived				
5. Shop Teachers				

6. Others (specify

____

7. How many more of the following teaching positions do you presently need to fully run the educational program as you would like to? Please indicate number needed.

Position	Number needed
1. Corrective Reading Teacher	
2. Guidance	
3. Remedial Math Instruction	
4. Services to the Deprived	
5. Shop Teachers	
6. Others (specify)	

8. Other than the personnel in this project, how many auxiliary professional personnel have been assigned to your school?

If you answered Question 5 with #3, or indicated that you neither received nor were assigned personnel under this project, you have completed your part of the questionnaire. If not, please continue.

9. How and by whom were the personnel employed in, or assigned to, this project selected?

10. How and by whom were the pupils in this project selected?

11. To your knowledge, have the teachers in this project received special training in their area of specialization? Please check the appropriate response and if YES, specify the type of training.

Position	Yes	No	Don't Know	Type of Training as far as you know
1. Corrective Reading Teacher				
2. Guidance				
3. Remedial Math Instruction				
4. Services to the Deprived				
5. Shop Teachers				
6. Others (specify)				

12. a) Did you receive an additional allotment of supplies and/or materials specifically for this project?

1. Yes   2. No

b) If YES, please describe

c) If NO, what are your needs?

13. a) Are the parents in the community aware of the implementation of this project in this school?

1. Yes   2. No

b) If YES, how were the parents informed about this project?

c) Please describe their reaction to this project.

B. ORGANIZATION

14. a) Have you made any physical changes, space additions or adjustments to accommodate this project?

    1. Yes   2. No

    b) If YES, please describe

15. a) Do you feel that the assignment of personnel to this project has affected teacher morale?

    b) If so, how?

16. a) To what extent has the assignment of personnel to this project had a noticeable impact on improving academic performance?

    1. Clearly noticeable
    2. Noticeable
    3. Slightly noticeable
    4. Not noticeable
    5. Too early to tell

    b) On what do you base this estimate?

17. To what extent has the assignment of personnel to this project been noticeable in effecting a change in pupil attitude?

    1. Clearly noticeable
    2. Noticeable
    3. Slightly noticeable
    4. Not noticeable
    5. Too early to tell

C. CRITIQUE AND SUGGESTIONS

18. In your opinion, what are the specific strengths of this project?

19. In your opinion, what are the specific weaknesses of this project?

20. What recommendations would you suggest to improve this project?

APPENDIX C

STAFF LIST

Louise W. Fox, Evaluation Director
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Foundations
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Maureen Smith, Research Assistant
Office of Research and Evaluation Services
The City College
The City University of New York

Henriette B. Wolkoff, Administrative Assistant

Miriam Balmuth, Observer
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

August Brezina, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Eugene Bucchioni, Observer
Professor
Department of Education
Herbert H. Lehman College
The City University of New York

Mary Owen Cameron, Observer
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Gloria Chotin, Observer
Instructor
Department of Education
Queens College
The City University of New York

Judith Danoff, Observer
Lecturer
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Richard Durnin, Observer
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Sophie Elam, Observer
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Audrey Herr, Observer
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Doris Hiller, Observer
Educational Consultant
Play Schools Association

William Jacobs, Observer
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Anita Rich, Observer
Instructor
Department of Education
Queens College
The City University of New York

Victor Sanua, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Bernard Schneider, Observer
Assistant Professor
Coordinator of Student Teaching
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Helene Sherman, Observer
Lecturer
Department of Education
Richmond College
The City University of New York

Marvin Siegelman, Observer
Associate Professor
Department of Social and
Psychological Foundations
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Armand E. Thibodeau, Observer
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Queens College
The City University of New York

Emmeline Weinberg, Observer
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Sophie Colten, Clerk

Mary Dover, Clerk

Rae M. Feeley, Statistical Clerk

David Guthwin, Clerk

Emanuel Kay, Clerk

Robert D. Kelley, Clerk

Howard B. Schapker, Clerk

Joseph Schenker, Clerk

Cathy Shiflett, Statistical Clerk

Josephine Thomas, Clerk

Verna B. White, Secretary